

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas be permitted to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, while I am very happy to be a freshman Member from Texas and a very freshman member of the Committee on Agriculture, I wish to commend the gentleman from Texas for his work here this evening in behalf of the farmers of Texas who have so long relied upon the gentleman in his leadership on the farm problems of the country.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from Texas for coming to the forefront and for letting the other people of this country, this great country of ours, know of the plight of the farmers that all of us are trying to help and that the gentleman has helped for so many years in this country.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA], and I appreciate his kind words.

Mr. Speaker, I would congratulate, not him, but the people of his district, which is probably the greatest agricultural district in the State of Texas, producing about one-tenth of all the products in our State, and I congratulate them on their fine representation on the Committee on Agriculture.

#### VIETNAM: ELECTION HAZARDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FRIEDEL). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. GOODELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, to prophesy events in Vietnam is to rush in where angels fear to tread. There is, however, ground for hope for a respite in the civil strife which has wracked that nation and which has forced the United States to assume the major part of the war against the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese troops while the South Vietnamese fought each other.

The recent turbulence in Da Nang, Hue, and Saigon has had a disturbing effect on public opinion in the United States. Americans who support resistance to Communist aggression began to think for the first time of the possibility of the withdrawal of American military power from Vietnam. Realism compels recognition of this possibility. If, because of war weariness or internal divisions, the South Vietnamese themselves withdraw from the military conflict against the Communists and if civil order disintegrates in chaos and anarchy, the United

States may have no alternative but to withdraw.

Let no one think, however, that withdrawal by the United States in such circumstances would be anything but a catastrophic defeat for our Nation and the greatest triumph that communism has ever achieved. Let no one think that withdrawal would bring peace and an end to American casualties. It would, on the contrary, whet the appetite of our foes for further conquest. It would be, not the end of war, but a prelude to a larger, bloodier, more costly war.

To prevent this outcome in Vietnam, the administration should now move ahead with the urgent political and military tasks that need attention. Above all, unity and stability are needed.

Whether wisely or not, both the Ky government and the United States committed themselves at the Honolulu Conference to seeking unity and stability through free elections in South Vietnam. Thus, it is hoped a government with a mandate will emerge—a government which will command the allegiance of all the major factions of South Vietnamese society, a government that belongs to the people of South Vietnam, a government that will satisfy the legitimate demands of South Vietnamese for political and social justice.

#### PAST ELECTIONS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

On five occasions since South Vietnam came into being in 1954, nationwide elections have been held. These elections have not been fair and free according to generally accepted standards in advanced democratic nations. Nor, with one exception, have they been significantly successful in promoting stability and unity.

On October 23, 1955, the question of who was to rule South Vietnam was settled by a plebiscite between President Diem and the former French puppet emperor, Bao Dai. The final election results showed 5,721,735 votes for Diem; 63,017 for Bao Dai.

This election helped to dispose finally of Bao Dai and to end French efforts to depose Diem.

It was, however, a corrupt election. Although, as Prof. Bernard Fall writes, Diem's American advisers assured him that a 60-percent success was more than sufficient, Diem insisted on a 98-percent mandate and set about to secure it. The election itself was run, according to a British Embassy official, with a "cynical disregard for decency and democratic principles." In Saigon, which had only 450,000 registered voters, Diem received more than 600,000 votes, a pattern repeated in several other areas.

Fortified by this victory at the polls, Diem announced in January 1956, general elections for a constitutional assembly. The Assembly was elected to ratify a constitution drafted by Diem. If it failed to do so within 45 days, the constitutional assembly was to be dissolved, and the proposed document would then be submitted to the people in a referendum. According to the election law, all citizens over 18 were eligible to vote. Candidates had to be over 25, to have lived in South Vietnam for over 6 months prior to the election, and had to produce

a judicial certificate establishing that they were not Communists or otherwise antigovernment.

Prior to the election itself, a number of steps were taken to suppress suspected opponents of the regime. On January 11, it was announced that a leading nationalist opposition group, the Revolutionary Committee, had been dissolved. When its president, M. Nguyen Bao Toan, vigorously denied this assertion, troops were dispatched to occupy the party's headquarters. Indeed, the Revolutionary Committee had been dissolved.

The next step was to arrest Dr. Pham Quang Dan, leader of another nationalist faction, the Republican Party, for distributing leaflets protesting the election law. Then, 8,000 Communists were swept up and followed Dr. Dan into prison. Numerous independent candidates "reconsidered" their candidacy and withdrew.

Although press censorship was temporarily lifted during the election campaign, all publication of news or commentary favorable to "Communist or antinational activities" remained punishable by jail sentence up to 5 years. It was not surprising, therefore, that most opposition leaders boycotted the election, nor that the pro-Government parties dominated the new Assembly.

The two opposition parties, the Social Democrats and the Dai Viet, received two and one seats, respectively. Representatives of pro-Government parties won 101 seats, and independents won 19.

The next election in South Vietnam, held in August 1959, was for the purpose of selecting members of the legislative assembly. Election was by plurality vote in single member constituencies of roughly equal population, with the exception of Saigon, which was heavily underrepresented. Although candidates were permitted to run either as independents or under party labels, the fact that all political parties required approval of the Department of Interior either to form or continue in existence dramatically reduced the ability of any opposition to conduct an organized campaign. The election laws proclaimed as their central feature "full democratic expression" on the part of voters and "absolute equality in campaigning" among the candidates. This latter element involved an interesting program.

An electoral propaganda committee was formed in each district and charged with electoral preparations for the candidates on the basis of absolute equality among all candidates. The committees were comprised of a representative of each party-nominated candidate and one for all independent candidates. They undertook all arrangements for public meetings, radio talks, the use of radio and sound trucks, and space in the press. The committees' powers extended even to deciding the size, color, and kind of paper to be used for handbills and posters, the dates and places for their posting and distribution. The committees' approval for the working of all campaign literature was imperative.

Since the committees were composed almost entirely of representatives of party—i.e., Government—approved can-

I am sure there is no other man in the United States any more knowledgeable in the matter of farm policy than the gentleman from Texas.

In my opinion, the statement the gentleman has made today should have widespread coverage all over the United States, equally as widespread as the newspaper articles he mentioned today. I believe if we could have this information given out to the American people we could come to a better understanding of what actually are the problems in American agriculture. For this I compliment the gentleman from Texas for his fine statement.

Mr. POAGE. I thank the gentleman from Nebraska. I hope the gentleman from Nebraska will, at a later date, discuss some of those phases himself.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I wish to join my good friend from Nebraska in expressing appreciation to the gentleman from Texas for a most statesmanlike and constructive speech.

I hope the Democratic National Committee will undertake to reprint this speech and to circulate it across the country, because I believe it will enlighten the people in our country as to the basic and fundamental facts of life about our farm program and the role which American agriculture is playing today in keeping the United States No. 1 in the free world.

I do not think any other segment of our society contributes so much to the pre-eminent position which our Nation occupies in the world today as does the American farmer. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], who has been one of the principal architects of our farm policy for a number of years here in Washington can certainly claim a great deal of credit for the enlightened policies which we have followed, which have made possible the position our Nation occupies today.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the kind words of the gentleman from Oklahoma, who has himself been so interested in the welfare of our farmers and all of our people during his long years of service here.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I also want to commend the gentleman from Texas for taking this time and indicating here that in the future he will take some more time at which time I will be glad to participate in the debate on this subject.

I also want especially to commend the gentleman from Texas for pointing out the tremendous progress that has been made in the United States of America in agriculture in the past 30 years, especially pointing to the fact that except for this great progress in productivity we today would have lines waiting to get enough meat or enough food instead of having what is called a problem, because we have a surplus.

This is the only country in the whole world where, when you refer to a farm problem, you are referring to the problem of managing a surplus instead of the problem of trying to find enough food to fill the stomachs of hungry people.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for taking this time and indicating that he will take some more time next week.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, as he always does, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] has shed some light on some of the deep problems involved here. I think he is generally recognized as one of the deep thinkers in regard to agriculture in the House. I very much appreciate his kind remarks and hope that he, too, will avail himself of the opportunity of discussing at least some of the specialized phases of our agricultural problems during the coming weeks.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Texas yielding to me. I certainly want to commend my colleagues in congratulating the gentleman from Texas, the vice chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, for the discussion that he has brought to us today.

Certainly any emphasis we can give across the length and breadth of the Nation with reference to agriculture and to the increase in the cost to the consumers, which includes the producer, one of the greatest consumers in the field of farm implements, equipment, and so forth, is of great benefit. While he has gained relatively little in the cost of producing foods and fibers, and so forth, for this Nation, his costs have gone up. This is a most worthwhile discussion.

I commend the gentleman on what he has done. I think he will agree with me that with the attitude of the American farmer and producer perhaps we have not yet scratched the surface, because, based on our greatest resource, the God-given soil, with modern hydroponics coming on, we can even increase this yield as necessity demands and perhaps carry out some of the great things which we now plan to do here and around the world. In this way we can support our own population explosion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me say I was particularly glad to hear what the gentleman from Texas had to say about the cropland restoration. As he knows, I am vitally interested in restoring to the soil what we take out of it as long as we can, at least in a time of overproduction. I have worked hard on this matter. I, too, look forward to his next stanza and verse on this Tuesday following. I shall plan to be here and hope that I can help further with something similar to the more involved cropland restoration.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the gentleman has said about the producer of American foodstuffs.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Missouri, who has always been deeply interested in the

restoration of our land and the maintenance of our soils, making this statement. I certainly agree with him that we are going to see vast increases in our production. I am not one who accepts the Malthusian theory or the idea that we are soon going to be starving, because I believe scientific research and farmer ingenuity is going to move forward just as rapidly in the future as it has in the past.

And for the past 100 years it has certainly moved more rapidly than population, and I believe it will in the next 100 years.

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to have been here this afternoon to hear the vice chairman of the Committee on Agriculture on which I have the privilege to serve give this fine exposé of agriculture in the past and as we face the future.

Mr. Speaker, having been born and reared on a farm myself in similar circumstances to what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], our vice chairman, has described, I can appreciate very, very readily what they are referring to, both as to the strengthening of the price of commodities that farmers have to sell through the use of farm programs aimed in that direction and our ability to increase production.

Mr. Speaker, it certainly is significant that the American farm economy now finds itself in the position to meet the challenge that will be made, worldwide, in helping to defend and feed persons in other areas, in helping to send food to people all over the world.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the gentleman in the well say many times that freedom from starvation is the first freedom. We have to carry that freedom to other peoples of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the gentleman from Texas will lend real leadership to the bill that is going to come before this body, the bill to provide food for peace and freedom.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the gentleman from Texas would comment upon the relationship as to the need for having a sound program.

What has been the relationship, I will ask the gentleman from Texas, between the price support program and the returns to the farmer as to the price which he has received during the great number of years in the past?

Mr. POAGE. I certainly appreciate the comments of my friend, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. REDLIN], whom I know is a practical, operating farmer, living on his ability to produce, produce and sell his products in the market.

However, Mr. Speaker, I would be reluctant to get into a discussion of the price programs at this time, because they are involved in what I hope to discuss the next time under a special order. However, Mr. Speaker, I consider it vitally important.



June 1, 1966

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400080019-0

11335

didates, the degree to which the Government controlled the preelection machinery can be easily imagined.

The Government defrayed all campaign expenses. In fact, the candidates and their supporters were expressly forbidden to spend money on their own or to engage in activities such as public meetings outside the framework approved by the election committees.

The campaign period itself lasted 2 weeks.

The most noticeable evidence of the campaign was the great number of banners, posters, and similar pieces of electoral propaganda. It was interesting to note that posters exhorting participation in the election outnumbered those for the candidates by a margin of 15 to 1.

Contrasting the 1956 polling, when the Communists were able to disrupt a number of local elections, the Government was able to report in 1959 that "the elections took place in perfect order without any security incidents." About 6,300,000 of South Vietnam's 7,300,000 voters exercised their option, a participation rate of 86 percent.

Once again the election results surprised few astute local observers. Only in Saigon where the foreign press scrutinized the election closely did candidates win who were opposed by the ruling apparatus and these unwelcome individuals, Dr. Phan Quang Dan and M. Nguyen Tran, were speedily dispatched on charges of election law violation. Neither was able to take his seat.

Robert G. Scigliano described the election methods employed:

The Government's tactics . . . ranged from scrupulous fairness in observing the letter of the election laws to behind the scenes manipulations to violate their spirit. In general, it appears that the voting was carried on in fairness and secrecy and that ballots generally were honestly counted, although improprieties could have been carried out in the provinces.

One newspaper reported that a person was arrested in a rural district because she protested against an election official's demand that she vote for a certain candidate and stories of ballot boxes which disappeared circulated throughout the Provinces—Times of Vietnam, September 4, 1959.

Though ballots may have been counted honestly, every other stage of the election process was carefully directed. First, the Government controlled the participation of political parties in the election and it employed this power to prevent any organization of potential opposition. Second, it screened the candidates, and outside of Saigon, "persuaded" a number to withdraw from the election. One hundred and sixty-five candidates out of a total of 460 "decided" to drop from the list of office-seekers. As one Province chief—himself a Government appointee—explained to a foreign visitor, the Government was concerned that the candidates be "sincere" and not run simply to cause trouble. Certain candidates were given special help during the campaign. The majority leader of the National Assembly, for example, sent out a mailing to

his constituents, an illegal action under the "equality" provisions of the election law, based on name and address records furnished him by the police. Although all candidates appeared to receive roughly equal treatment in the placement of posters, special posters were put up around a number of the polling places in Saigon for certain Government candidates on the eve of the election. Further, small bombs were set off outside some Saigon printing houses to discourage them from printing posters and handbills for opposition candidates. Hecklers, presumably under Government instruction, operated against various candidates.

The final elections of the Diem era in September of 1963 followed a similar pattern. Among the successful candidates for the National Assembly were the secret police chief and his wife, M. and Mme. Ngo Dinh Nhu, who swept their constituencies with 99.9 and 99.8 percent majorities respectively. Later Ngo Dinh Nhu was voted president of the Assembly. In the 1963 elections of 6,809,078 total registered voters, 6,329,831 were listed as having exercised their option to vote.

On May 30, 1965, a municipal and provincial election was conducted under the aegis of the short-term civilian Premier Phan Huy Quat. It is difficult to assess the legitimacy of this particular polling. Published estimates indicate that roughly 4.5 million were eligible to vote in Government-held territory and of these about 70 percent or 3.3 million were declared to have voted.

#### CURRENT OBSTACLES TO GENUINE ELECTIONS

This recital of the experience of South Vietnam with elections does not give ground for confidence that genuinely free and meaningful elections will be held in that unhappy land in 1966. Though significantly different from the elections in Communist nations, past elections have been controlled so as to limit closely the choice available to the voter.

In addition to the tradition of controlled elections, there are at present staggering obstacles to meaningful balloting in South Vietnam. A substantial part of the population lives in territory controlled by Communist forces. This situation was reflected in the drop of 3 million votes—almost 50 percent of the total—when the election of 1965 is compared with that of 1963. Many other voters will be subject to the threat of violence by the Communists.

Free elections require free debate and open channels of communication between candidates and the electorate. In great parts of South Vietnam, because of the war and inadequate methods of communication, these are likely to be lacking.

Free and meaningful elections are difficult without political parties. Parties are needed for the conduct of a campaign that will make clear the choice before the voters in the election. They are needed to inform the electorate, to unify like-minded voters, and to motivate people to cast ballots. There are no

real political parties in Vietnam. The rudimentary kind of political organization that exists is probably not adequate for the task.

Finally, free and meaningful elections require acceptance of the results and a willingness to cooperate on the part of winners and losers after the election is over. There is room for doubt that this spirit exists among all factions in South Vietnam today.

Ten years ago Hans Morgenthau said:

Free elections are very subtle instruments which require a dedication to certain moral values and the existence of certain moral conditions which are by no means prevalent throughout the world, and certainly not prevalent in either North or South Vietnam.

There is grave doubt that these conditions exist in South Vietnam today.

#### A POLICY FOR THE UNITED STATES

For all these reasons it is hard to conceive of free and meaningful elections in South Vietnam under present conditions. Elections of some kind are, nevertheless, in prospect, and it is too late to debate whether or not they should be held.

The United States should not attempt to determine the outcome of any elections held in Vietnam. Yet the United States cannot be a completely uninterested bystander in forthcoming Vietnamese elections because it has committed itself to abide by the results of free elections in that nation. The United States influenced the Ky government in making its promise of elections. The United States cannot be indifferent to the fact that the elections may have profound effects on its future policy. Consequently, the administration should now clarify its policy toward the elections.

The administration should be concerned about three pitfalls that may lie ahead. One is the danger of elections rigged to ensure an outcome desired by the Ky government. A second pitfall is the danger of elections disrupted by violence, terrorism, and disorder on the part of Communists or anti-Ky elements or both. A third pitfall is the danger of elections that will intensify disorder and confusion and settle nothing.

To avert these dangers, the administration should attempt to bring about the conditions needed for genuinely free and meaningful elections in South Vietnam. At least, let it make clear what the United States means by free elections.

In my judgment, elections worthy of the description as free and meaningful are possible only if three minimal conditions are met.

First, a preelection agreement is required among responsible representatives of all major groups offering candidates to accept the outcome of the balloting. Although it may be difficult to enforce such an agreement, a public commitment in advance that the principal interest groups will not attempt to nullify the results of a fair election by force should have some moral effect. If nothing else, this should help to dispel some of the suspicion and moderate some of the an-

June 1, 1966

tagonism that now threaten to make elections in South Vietnam an empty exercise.

Second, supervision of the political campaign, and the election process by an international commission of disinterested third-party states with a tradition of free elections is required. Neither the United States nor any Communist state should be a member of such a commission. The rules governing the conduct of the campaign should be formulated and enforced by a truly neutral and independent commission. To do its work, it must have unrestricted access to all areas within South Vietnam in which balloting takes place. Certification by this commission that the election was fair and free would be required before the vote on any question submitted to the voters could be considered valid. Before any candidate assumes any office as a result of the election, his election should be certified by the commission as free from fraud or terrorism.

To use the International Control Commission set up under the Geneva agreement of 1954 as the supervisory agency would be to destroy any prospect of a free election. It is enough to observe that Poland is a member of that commission. The kind of elections held in Poland, in pursuance of the promise of free elections in the Yalta agreement, is not what Vietnam needs today.

In view of past experience, the United Nations offers a dubious expedient as a supervisory agency. The United Nations has ducked every question relating to Vietnam. A more important consideration is that any supervisory agency appointed by the United Nations would probably include representation for the Communist world where free elections are neither understood nor practiced.

Third, a meaningful election requires a direct vote on the basic issue of the war in Vietnam. For this reason, there should be a plebiscite on the demand made by Hanoi that the National Liberation Front assume full political power in South Vietnam. It is important that those who draft the South Vietnamese Constitution and those who hold public office know the sentiments of the voters on this issue.

I would expect that a plebiscite on this question would result in an overwhelming defeat for the Communist forces. It would demonstrate conclusively to the world the falsity of the widely accepted charge that the United States is seeking to suppress by force a national movement that enjoys the support of the majority of the people of South Vietnam. It would thereby strengthen the moral position of the Government of South Vietnam and of the United States among fairminded people throughout the world.

In South Vietnam itself, the submission of this issue to a vote would help to shift the attention of the contending factions from the secondary question involved in their scramble for power to the primary issue on which they are agreed. All responsible leaders in South Vietnam have declared their opposition to Communist rule. The plebiscite, then, could be a step toward putting first things first and achieving national unity.

Some have proposed a truce in Vietnam in connection with the elections. The main objection to such a proposal is the strong likelihood that any truce would in fact be unilateral, as was the truce proclaimed in Laos in 1961 and 1962 at the time of the Geneva negotiations.

A genuine truce—an absolute cessation of all fighting and of all terrorism, a halt to the movement of troops and military supplies into, and within, South Vietnam—would be conducive to a freer and more meaningful election. A truce that is not strictly observed would be a snare and a delusion.

The administration has taken a stand for free elections in South Vietnam. It cannot condone a rigged election even if the rigging is done by its friends. To do so would weaken further its credibility throughout the world. And a rigged election would not advance the cause of freedom, independence, and unity in South Vietnam. The result would be deepened division, not unity—heightened antagonism, not reconciliation. Such an election would not satisfy the losers nor would it strengthen the victors.

On the other hand, an election marked by fraud and terrorism which resulted in strengthening the position of elements that are ready to accept Communist rule in South Vietnam could make the position of the United States there untenable.

From its postwar experience with Eastern Europe, this Nation should have learned by now that the consequences of perverted and distorted so-called free elections are grave, if not disastrous.

It will be too late to cry foul after the fact if fraudulent elections produce results unfavorable to the independence and freedom of South Vietnam.

A pledge by participants to accept the election results, careful impartial electoral supervision, and a direct plebiscite on the issue of the war are indispensable, minimal requisites for free and meaningful elections.

The United States should foster the cause of popular government in South Vietnam in every possible way. Honest and meaningful elections are not the only way to this goal, and in the present situation they may not be the best way. But, since elections are to be held, we can start there.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman from New York will yield to me.

Mr. GOODELL. I yield with pleasure.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, first, I want to commend the gentleman for having presented his remarks on the floor of the House. Since I had occasion to comment on them when they were released to the press before they were delivered here, I think I ought perhaps just to comment on my impressions of the speech as given. I think that the gentleman has certainly covered an interesting historical discussion of the subject of elections and has made one of the points that I have been trying to make for some time; namely, that any kind of election in Vietnam at this time, in the circumstances that exist there, is bound

to be a difficult procedure. As the gentleman has pointed out, it would be difficult to know when such election could really be representative of the sentiment of the Vietnamese people.

I am somewhat at a loss to understand exactly why the gentleman dwelt on these circumstances as extensively as he did and suggested conditions which are almost certainly not going to exist in that war-troubled country for some time to come. I certainly hope that the gentleman's ideal conditions are not being set forth today so that if the practical situation that exists does not measure up in every respect to that ideal the gentleman might be able to say it was the fault of the administration.

Mr. GOODELL. If I may interrupt at this point—and I will yield to the gentleman further—I do not suggest that the conditions that I have elucidated here are ideal conditions. I have pointed out that this country is now committed, for better or for worse, apparently, to elections in South Vietnam, and that the country of South Vietnam is committed to this.

Mr. Speaker, under those circumstances, ideal conditions are not available, if they ever could be. I have talked about minimal requisites to a meaningful election, an election that can avoid perhaps a total disaster from the viewpoint of those South Vietnamese who wish independence and from the viewpoint of the U.S. commitment in southeast Asia. They are minimal. They are not ideal.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further—

Mr. GOODELL. I yield further to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. The only suggestion in his remarks that is at all unusual, other than the historic review, is the proposal that we ought to have a national plebiscite on whether to let the Vietcong take over the country or, in other words, whether the country wants to surrender to the Vietcong.

Mr. Speaker, this would be a little bit like the suggestion of a Member of the other body from our State who suggested some time ago that we would have to admit the Vietcong into a coalition government.

Mr. GOODELL. If the suggestion I make sounds like that, then the gentleman has not listened very carefully or has not seen the context in which I propose it.

I have very clearly stated my belief; I would not support our commitment in southeast Asia against Communist terrorism and aggression if I did not believe this from the depths of my being, that the South Vietnamese people in overwhelming numbers would reject the proposal from Hanoi. It is important if we are going to have elections that may be extremely confusing in an underdeveloped country, without a tradition of free elections, that we have a clear mandate on this point, because if the elections are not held in a proper manner and if these minimal conditions are not met, our position could be untenable.



Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would let me comment on his remarks—and I do not know whether we have any time left, but perhaps the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] would give me some time during the next special order—I realize that the gentleman has indicated that he thinks the Vietcong would not win such an election and I would certainly agree with him overwhelmingly.

I notice, however, that there has been some change in the release of the gentleman's speech as prepared for delivery today and the original release that went out earlier and which got into the press on Monday of this week.

Mr. GOODELL. I am glad that the gentleman had the release, because he has made a point of saying that he did not know what I said in advance when I did make this available as of Friday of last week.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I just got the release from the Press Gallery, because the gentleman's release that was sent to my office obviously had some changes made. But the point I think that the gentleman overlooks is, first of all, that elections, as was already indicated, are going to be very difficult in Vietnam.

Then this would apply to any such plebiscite as such?

Mr. GOODELL. What does the gentleman suggest as to elections? We have got to have elections at this point apparently under the commitment of the Ky government and this administration.

Mr. STRATTON. If the gentleman will let me make my point, otherwise there is no point in discussing his remarks—

Mr. GOODELL. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman for a dialog or a colloquy, but I do not want him to have a soliloquy here. I believe we ought to have some discussion.

Mr. STRATTON. I thank the gentleman for his courtesy.

I was going to say that it would be a major mistake if we followed the suggestion which the gentleman makes that we will hold a plebiscite, on what I consider to be the major issue of the war, is whether the country ought to surrender to the Vietcong, which certainly is the major issue of the war. I do not believe the Vietnamese people have any concern for this at all, but the major issue is how to get a coalition government that will bring about the support of the majority of the people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FRIEDEL). The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

# A TIME TO RALLY BEHIND PRESIDENT JOHNSON AS VICTORY NEARS IN VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FRIEDEL). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mr. PUCINSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we undoubtedly are now on the threshold of historical events in Vietnam. Our military forces have now taken virtually complete command of the military situation. We have disrupted totally the lines of communication of the enemy. We have isolated most of the large cities in North Vietnam to the point where there is practically nothing moving in or out of Hanoi. Our American soldiers and our allies; the Australians, the South Koreans, and the others, have indeed written a fantastic chapter of gallantry on the battlefield under the most severe conditions. The entire free world has a right to be proud of them.

President Johnson has quite properly pointed out in his Memorial Day speech that the big problem in Vietnam today is to a great extent political. So it appears to me at this very critical crossroad in history, when the future of world peace is being decided in Vietnam, the cause of peace and justice can best be served by the American people rallying around President Johnson and rallying around the leaders of South Vietnam and trying to keep our colloquys and our criticisms to a minimum.

This is not to suggest that we should cut off debate or criticism, but I think that the next few weeks will call for extremely responsible conduct on the part of all concerned. There is no question that the vast majority of Buddhists in South Vietnam are trying to work out some sort of accommodation with General Ky so that they can proceed to hold elections. There is no question that some of the political forces in South Vietnam now are struggling for political position so that they can have a voice in the elections and in the government which will emerge after the elections.

I would hate to see a single American life lost in Vietnam because the Communists have again miscalculated our intentions. I respect the gentleman who preceded me and I think he has made an eloquent statement here in suggesting that every step be taken to guarantee that the elections are properly conducted. But I am sure the gentleman is not living in a dream world. The situation in Vietnam today is chaotic. They cannot have in war-torn Vietnam the kind of elections that we have in most of the communities in America in peacetime. The important thing is to give these people an opportunity, under the most difficult conditions, to carve their own destiny in a free election. That is our pledge in Vietnam; that is our promise and that is the hope of the South Vietnamese.

There is every reason to believe today, as we improve with every hour our military situation, that the political problems of South Vietnam can be resolved and that the elections commission will be representative of all factions defending freedom and that indeed it is going to set down ground rules for the elections acceptable to all sides so that the elections can be conducted on September 11 and then the people of South Vietnam can through their elected representatives, decide the future course for their nation.

We have reason to believe today despite the apparent chaos that is now going on in South Vietnam that we can restore some order there.

It would be my hope that we can call upon those who want to participate in this dialog in America and in the rest of the world to be cautious and careful that their remarks do not prolong this conflict or the disorders in South Vietnam.

We know from surveys that have been conducted in South Vietnam by our own agencies; by the South Vietnamese and, yes, by various religious groups including the Quakers that more than 80 percent of the people in South Vietnam today are prepared to vote against any Communist representation in the future Government of South Vietnam.

Now with these facts and these figures, it appears to me we can all make a great contribution toward bringing this war to an early end by remaining resolute on the battlefield as we have and trusting in the integrity and in the intentions of those who are trying to put together this winning package both on the battlefield and in the political field in South Vietnam and, indeed, staying with President Johnson. I know of no man in this country—yes, and as a matter of fact in this entire world, who is more desirous of bringing this conflict in Vietnam to a victorious conclusion than President Johnson. I think the President has done extremely well up to now. He has weathered great criticism and great debate by formidable forces both in this chamber and in the other body, but President Johnson has not wavered once in his determination to hold the line against Communist aggression in South Vietnam.

The President has remained resolute. He has constantly reminded us that we learned our lesson well from World War II: to yield to aggression merely whets the appetite of the aggressor and leads to greater conflict. We are winning this war in Vietnam. There are imperfections. Of course we know there are imperfections. And there shall be setbacks. But the fact remains that generally and on a broad scale, the forces of freedom in Vietnam today are on the winning side.

So it is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that as we go into these crucial weeks when great things are happening—and, indeed, victory and freedom can be ours in South Vietnam—that we will not permit ourselves to get divided on details. Let us not lose track of the forest for the trees. Certainly we want to take every possible step to guarantee that these elections are free, that they are honest, and that they reflect the will of the people in that country. But for us now to tie ourselves up in the many details and the conditions that my colleague from New York has attempted to spell out here today would mean an unnecessary prolonging of this war. I think the American people have been magnificent in their attitude. They have supported and continue to support their President and their Government. But I do not think there is an American anywhere who

June 1, 1966

wants to prolong this war a day longer than it has to be.

I think if we see the work of this election commission and see the ground rules they spell out very shortly, we will be satisfied that we can have a meaningful election in South Vietnam. And we can have it by September 11,—yes under very difficult conditions—but, with the help of our Lord and the heroic determination of our soldiers, we will keep our pledge to give the people of South Vietnam the elections they are entitled to.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. In the first place much of what the gentleman has said, it seems to me, is irrelevant to the proposal I have made. Certainly I found nothing in my remarks—and I worked very carefully to see to it that there was nothing in my remarks—that implied any particular viewpoint on why we are where we are today in Vietnam. I made the specific, positive, and I think constructive suggestions to meet the problem of so-called free elections in South Vietnam. The gentleman has said that we are going to go ahead and have these elections. The gentleman must well recognize that these are hazardous operations and activities in a country such as Vietnam, and we should exercise our influence to see to it that the elections are, first of all, free and, second of all, meaningful, and that is what my proposals were aimed to accomplish.

I am sure the gentleman would not recommend that we withdraw from Vietnam at this time.

Mr. PUCINSKI. On the contrary, let us not read anything like that into it. I am one of those who have stood in this well time and again and have urged and supported our position in Vietnam. I have stated repeatedly that we cannot retreat from Communist aggression. I suggest to the gentleman from New York that perhaps it is he who is unwittingly suggesting that some of the conditions he is setting up, well meaning as they may be, would unnecessarily prolong the war when we see victory in Vietnam now and perhaps lead to our withdrawal before victory is finalized for the people of South Vietnam.

The gentleman must keep in mind that every time a speech is presented here which is critical of our position, the Vietcong take on false hope that maybe our will to resist is failing and they continue the war thinking we will cave in. We do not want any American boys killed because the Communists miscalculated these speeches.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 10 minutes, and I will share the time with the gentleman from New York.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? The Chair hears none;

the gentleman is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman made reference to the divisions within our country, encouraging miscalculation of Communists themselves. I would say to the gentleman that I have not in my prepared address, or in any of my comments, made any reference to those in our midst who sincerely but in my opinion ill-advisedly are encouraging the Communists to miscalculation. They have a right to raise these questions.

But I would say to the gentleman in the well the people who are raising the questions that could cause miscalculation among the Communists are primarily members of his own party.

He is addressing his remarks to the wrong individual when he addresses them to the gentleman from New York on this point.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman from New York suggests some plebiscite to decide whether or not the Vietcong which is dedicated to the overthrow of the present Government of South Vietnam by force and violence and terrorism and subversion should be admitted to the government. The gentleman is suggesting some sort of plebiscite to further determine whether or not the Vietcong should be admitted. I say he is suggesting delays that are unnecessary. Furthermore, he is suggesting we postpone the real elections in Vietnam when he suggests such a plebiscite.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman in the well has said that the result of such a plebiscite, we are confident, would be overwhelming, and would clear the air and give guidance. But the gentleman wants to have elections now in very confusing circumstances.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I trust the gentleman would not recommend a plebiscite in this country to recognize a party that is determined to overthrow this Government by force and violence.

Mr. GOODELL. We in this country have regular elections, and are proud we do.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. I believe the gentleman from Illinois has made his point on this. We are all in favor of free elections, and are all concerned about the problem. The proposal of whether there should be a plebiscite or whether we should surrender to the Vietcong is something, as the gentleman from Illinois has indicated, that could only complicate and delay the delicate and extremely essential job that is now going forward very successfully to establish meaningful elections, to get a free, representative, non-Communist government established in South Vietnam.

The idea that we ought to stop all of this and to hold some kind of plebiscite under conditions that the gentleman from New York admits are extremely difficult and hazardous anyway would

be to play entirely into the Communist hands.

Nobody thinks this is the central issue of the war except the Vietcong themselves. Yet the gentleman in his remarks says this is the central issue. The central issue is how are we going to get the Buddhists and the Cao Dais and the Cao Haos and the military and the Catholics all to pull together to establish a solid government, to back up the great military victory that General Westmoreland is winning, as the gentleman pointed out.

I am sure the gentleman from New York was well meaning in his suggestion. But the proposal he is making is like asking one whether he has stopped beating his wife. No matter what the answer is, he is in trouble.

Why should we play the game on the Communist terms?

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman has made a very significant contribution. Again I renew my plea that these Monday morning quarterbacks, sitting back here in Washington, who have been trying to second guess this war and second guess our determination to win this war, take a little respite and let the legitimate forces in Vietnam, and our own generals, and our own President—the people who are dedicated to the destruction of communism in Vietnam—have a chance to work.

Every time there is some major statement in this country critical of how the war is being conducted, it gives unwarranted and misleading confidence to the enemy that maybe our will to win is waning. I am not against criticism of the war, but perhaps a brief moratorium on irresponsible talk would help us bring it to a successful conclusion.

We have facts. We have figures. We know that Hanoi is counting on the fact that the will to resist communism is going to be broken here in Washington, the way it was in Paris. I never have been more proud of my President than when Mr. Johnson said that the war in Vietnam is not going to be lost in Washington the way it was lost in Paris.

Dienbienphu was not the reason for the French pullout. The reason for the French pullout was because the same kind of forces that have been trying to torpedo the war effort in this country were at play in Paris, and they created a political situation over there which made it mandatory for the French Government to seek the smallest excuse to get out of Vietnam. Dienbienphu came along as a convenient excuse, and they pulled their forces out. We would not be in Vietnam today if the French had not pulled out prematurely.

We ought to take a respite and get behind this war effort; get behind General Westmoreland; get behind our American soldiers who are fighting the toughest war in Vietnam; get behind the Government of South Vietnam and yes, get behind President Johnson, and give all these men a chance to pull together, as the gentleman from New York says, and get this war over with.

We are not going to get it over with by suggesting a time consuming plebi-



scite; by suggesting that the elections are not going to be honest before we even know the ground rules; by shattering confidence in these elections before they are held.

I suggest that for someone to come before this House, before we even know what the ground rules will be for these elections, and to say that these elections are going to be dishonest and this and that, only gives aid and comfort to the enemy. How do you expect to gather all the forces in Vietnam behind an election when a responsible Member of the American Congress says they will be dishonest before they have even been fully agreed to?

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I say we cannot have elections in Vietnam under such an aura of doubts planted here in the United States. All of these suggestions make me wonder how sincerely do all of these self-styled experts in Vietnam really want the war to end and how sincerely do they want an honorable peace which will end the needless slaughter of our boys in Vietnam. I say all of these innocent concerns about the validity of the elections are a smoke screen to needlessly prolong the war when our forces have victory virtually in their grasp.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I suggest that the gentleman read my speech. He is paraphrasing it inaccurately.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. STRATTON. The gentleman had a distinguished career in the newspaper profession. The gentleman has talked about a respite from Monday morning or Tuesday morning quarterbacks, as the case may be.

I wonder if the gentleman would agree with me that another thing we ought to do is to try to avoid the temptation of coming up with "gimmicks" as solutions. Would not the gentleman agree that the job is a difficult, a tough, and a sensitive job? Does not the gentleman agree that Ambassador Lodge and General Westmoreland are doing a tremendous job in moving us in the right direction?

Mr. PUCINSKI. That is correct.

Mr. STRATTON. Does not the gentleman feel that we ought to avoid coming up with "catchy" things, which might get an occasional newspaper headline, and get behind our President and our representatives in Vietnam?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I agree with the gentleman on one point. It seems to me that every time we are on the threshold of moving forward, every time we have big victories—and we have had some victories over there—the claque comes "claueing" around here in the United States, bringing up all sorts of smoke screens to hide it.

The President quite properly said in his press conference today that it is high time we started to tell the story of our successes in Vietnam. Those successes do not draw the headlines.

There has been some great reporting out of Vietnam. I commend those men

who have come forward and told the real stories of Vietnam. But I agree with the gentleman from New York, the less-experienced reporters have been looking for gimmicks; sensationalism instead of hard-core, in-depth reporting.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to my colleague from New York, Mr. GOODELL.

Mr. GOODELL. I would tell the gentleman that a great Member in his party in the other body today said that "eventual withdrawal, painful though that may be, is called for in Vietnam." He went on to say:

Let us hope our Administration leaders will be guided by the wisdom of U Thant, Secretary General of the United Nations, and will earnestly seek a ceasefire and withdrawal altogether from what has become an American war.

I say to the gentleman, those are not my words. Those are not my sentiments. I carefully prepared a speech that was constructive, in which I made positive suggestions and in which I was very careful to be responsible and nonpartisan.

The gentleman has chosen to take the well, and, as has my colleague from New York, to interpret this as a partisan attack, and to turn on me the accusations which they should turn on Members of their own party, for dividing this Nation in time of crisis.

Mr. PUCINSKI. If the gentleman will read the Record, I have no quarrel with his remarks, except that I believe they suggest unnecessary and further delays in bringing the war to a conclusion.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman paraphrased them incorrectly. That is the difficulty.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I do not know whom the gentleman quotes, but I must say whoever he is, he belongs to that category of quarterbacks who would do better to sit this out and find out where we are going.

Mr. GOODELL. Members of the gentleman's party are in that category.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I have complete confidence in the military. I have complete confidence in Secretary McNamara. I have complete confidence in Secretary Rusk, and I have unequivocal confidence in President Johnson. I believe these men are all dedicated to victory. I resent the idea when some people get up to say, "We do not have a blueprint. We do not have a program. We do not have a plan for victory in Vietnam." These are all smokescreens.

Mr. GOODELL. Could the gentleman find a single reference to any of the points he has made in my prepared address? Did the gentleman find a single reference to any points just made? It is only a straw man the gentleman has raised up, to knock down. He is not talking about my speech and my suggestions.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I do not know why my colleague from New York is objecting, because I have not objected to his speech. I had a special order of my own today to discuss Vietnam. All of my remarks during this time were not directed at my colleague from New York whom I respect very highly. I do not under-

stand why you feel my remarks are directed at you. You raised some questions and I told you I didn't agree with your point—as long as you raised the questions.

The main thrust of my remarks today is to suggest a moratorium on irresponsible criticism of our efforts in Vietnam so the Communists do not think our determination is wavering and a further appeal to get behind President Johnson when we are beginning to see victory in Vietnam. That is all I wanted to say here today.

Mr. GOODELL. That is a concession which I will keep in the Record, that the gentleman is not objecting to my speech. I hope he means he is in complete agreement.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I will let the record speak for itself.

#### THE PERCENTAGE DEPLETION ALLOWANCE ON NATIONAL RESOURCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, recent proposals for changing the tax structure have neglected an important area in which reform is needed; namely, the percentage depletion allowance on natural resources. The high allowance on gross income ranging from an allowance of 5 percent on brick and sand all the way up to 27½ percent on oil and gas—has been and continues to be a blatant form of tax favoritism. The depletion allowance represents an unjustifiable loss of revenue to the Government—a loss which other taxpayers have to make up.

The bill I am introducing will increase tax revenues by repealing the allowances. The increased revenues, according to a 1964 report of the U.S. Joint Economic Committee, may total up to \$1.5 billion annually. The additional revenue realized by this reform will hopefully open up the way toward tax relief for those who really need it—our taxpayers in the lower and middle income brackets, the bulk of America's purchasing power. Furthermore, the repeal will ease the inflationary pressures of excessive investment spending in the extractive industries by bringing profits down to a more reasonable level.

The depletion allowance was originally introduced to encourage the small operator who usually assumed a heavy risk. Existing tax treatment, however, often results in the greatest tax benefit for large corporations which usually assume the least risk. Already in 1961, 89 percent of the \$3.6 billion in depletion claimed by corporations was claimed on returns from firms with assets of \$10 million or more.

For large corporations, the depletion allowance is in effect a subsidy which promotes excess capacity, overinvestment, and misallocation of resources. It has these serious defects because it permits complete investment costs to be recovered many times over. Corporations can recover tax free the full

amount of their investment in the year it is made, and then in coming years claim additional depletion allowances on those same resources, allowances which bear no relationship to the amount of investment. In other words, the percentage depletion allowances bear no relation to actual development costs; they are deductions which are unwarranted and inequitable. My bill, by repealing the percentage depletion allowances, will correct these inequities.

#### GRAVE IMPLICATIONS OF FEDERAL ELECTRIC BANK LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, with almost no fanfare, the House Committee on Agriculture yesterday opened hearings on two bills that could turn the rural electrification system of this country into a giant public utility almost entirely free from congressional or any other control, with up to \$20 billion available for expansion over the next 15 years.

To illustrate the size of this proposed operation, let me say that the total capitalization of the entire electric power industry in the United States is about \$46 billion.

My purpose today is to alert Members and the public to the grave implications of the proposed Federal Electric Bank legislation, H.R. 14000, H.R. 14387 and related bills. These bills provide additional sources of financing for the rural electrification program.

Over the last 30 years, as a result of the REA program, the farms of the Nation have been electrified and abundant and cheap central-station electric service has been furnished to persons in rural areas. As this program has reached its fulfillment, there has been a growing and justified clamor for the transfer of the financing of this exceptionally successful endeavor from the Federal Government to the private money market. Let no one detract from the marvelous achievements that have been accomplished as a result of the low-cost, long-term Federal loans for construction of electric facilities to serve the farms and rural areas of the Nation. Also, in recognizing the great progress that has been made, let no one detract from the fact that in reaching this advanced stage of service many rural electric cooperatives have, themselves, simultaneously reached full-blown maturity with a degree of independence, efficiency, financial stability, and self-reliance, which compares favorably with corresponding elements in our free enterprise system. This is one of the inherent objectives of development programs. Success in providing a service can only be achieved when the entities created to provide the service concurrently become successful and self-reliant in themselves.

In my remarks today, however, I do not wish to dwell on the philosophy of development programs. REA has demonstrated that they serve a useful purpose. Rather, I shall try to point out to my colleagues certain provisions of the bills which will be considered by

the Agriculture Committee to provide supplemental financing for the rural electrification program which would change the scope of its responsibilities from a rural development program into a group of Government subsidized, large public utility systems largely without limit or control as to the type of loads they would serve, to the location of such loads or to the rates to be charged for power and energy. It would also create a number of budgetary and fiscal problems in the appropriations process.

First, the administration bill, H.R. 14837, would continue the present 2-percent loan program through the creation of a rural electrification account. Into this account would be placed all the assets and liabilities of the present program. The existing obligations to the Treasury would be transferred to the new account and provision would be made for use of the funds in the account for payment of interest and principal when due on loans that had been made to the Administrator by the Secretary of the Treasury for electrification purposes. The account would also be available for new 2-percent loans and for purchase of capital stock in a Federal bank which would be established by another title of the bill. Because of these other commitments for use of funds in the account, however, there will never be any money available for the foreseeable future for repayments on the Administrator's debt to Treasury. Whether such funds will ever be available in the type of operation proposed is doubtful and the taxpayers may never get their money back.

Another questionable feature of the bill is the absence of any provision for electrification account sections of the placing new loan authorizations in the rural electrification account. Section 301(4) of the bill provides that "appropriations" for electrification loans made under authority of section 3 of the basic act shall become part of the account, but there is no mention of any new loan authorizations that may be needed to finance any 2-percent loans that may be made under the plan of operation proposed by the Secretary of Agriculture. As you know, the REA loan program has, with minor exceptions, been financed over the years through borrowing from the Treasury, rather than through appropriations. Is this procedure now to be changed to provide that all new financing of 2-percent loans is to be made without any requirements for repayment of such amounts to the Treasury? Furthermore, in the section 302(b)(1), authorizing use of assets of the account for loans under sections 4 and 5 of the basic act, and for advances in connection therewith, there is language which says that no loans can be made in any year in excess of amounts "available pursuant to section 3 of the act." What does this mean? All of the nearly \$6 billion in money that has been provided to date for the REA program has been made available under the provisions of section 3 of the REA Act. This raises questions as to whether the limit is to encompass all loan authorizations and appropriations made over the years. Is it intended that the limitation

would be of that scope? If so, it is no limitation at all, and Congress would never have to act on the amounts available for loans. If it does not mean that, what does it mean? The language should be perfectly clear, so as to avoid any possible circumvention of the appropriation process in the future.

Now, moving to the Federal bank for rural electric systems, a Government corporation would be created which could be of a magnitude of capitalization reaching into many billions of dollars. If the borrowers should purchase stock in the bank to the extent of \$15 million per year, as estimated by NRECA, and stock is purchased by the United States and consumers, and debentures sold, all as contemplated in the bill, loans by borrowers could exceed \$15 billion by 1981. The bank would be the biggest organization of this character ever created. Moreover, when added to the \$4.5 billion of 2-percent loans expected to be made from the rural electrification account over the 15-year period, the total new capital involved will be more than 2½ times the \$8 billion, which the Secretary of Agriculture said would be required. Yet, the purposes for which the loans would be made by this bank are not defined. To the contrary, the scope and breadth of the types of facilities which could be undertaken with funds obtained from this source are practically limitless. Furthermore, with this enormous undertaking, the bill has no provisions for making the bank's operation self-supporting. Section 410 (b)(2) authorizes two types of loans. The first, called intermediate loans, would have a limit on interest of 4 percent. There is nothing in the bill which assures that these loans will be self-liquidating or amortized over their life. The administrative costs and reserves for losses would not be borne by the bank. They would be subsidized entirely by REA.

The legislation also provides for another type of loan which will bear interest at a rate which reflects the current average rate payable by the electric bank on its debentures plus administrative expenses and estimated losses. Again, however, there is no provision assuring that these loans will be amortized. Furthermore, the material attached to the Secretary's transmission of the bill to the Congress fails to indicate that this type of loan would be amortized. The bill also would authorize the adjustment of payments not only of principal but of interest. There would be no guarantee that either would necessarily ever be paid. Furthermore, the bill authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase notes issued by the bank if it has insufficient funds in the assets of the electric bank available for paying interest and principal on its debentures. This borrowing is without limitation as to time or amount. Even payments of interest on such notes could be deferred. Such borrowing could be for indefinite periods and would be completely beyond the control of the Congress. This is a perfect example of backdoor financing and the general looseness of the provisions of the administration bill is an outright invita-



Jr., Vice President and General Manager, Indianapolis Newspapers, Inc.; Richard Hollander, Editor, the Washington Daily News; and John C. O'Brien, Washington Bureau Chief, the Philadelphia Inquirer.

Kotz lives in Washington with his wife Mary Lynn and 5-year-old son Jack Mitchell. He attended St. Albans school in Washington and later majored in international relations at Dartmouth, where he was elected to Phi Beta Kappa and was graduated magna cum laude. He then attended the London School of Economics on a Reynolds Scholarship.

He served in the Marine Corps 1956-58 in the U.S., Japan and the Philippines. In 1958 he went to work for the Des Moines Register as a reporter covering police, city, county and state governments.

Kotz's dispatches on the summer job program also won the 1965 Sigma Delta Chi award for Washington correspondence. His other awards include the 1963 Community Service Award from the Jewish Chatauqua Society, for stories about Negro employment; and the 1961 Iowa Associated Press Newswriting Contest.

### OUR POSITION IN VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Illinois for his remarks. I think he has certainly served to focus attention on what is really the central issue in this situation in Vietnam. I think we in this House have been reasonably free of some of the suggestions and gimmicks that have been offered in another body. There have been Members in another body of both political parties who have come up with gimmicks of one kind or another designed to catch the headlines. But I was deeply troubled when one of the leading and outstanding Members on the minority side came up with one of these gimmicks himself, one that is playing exactly into the hands of the Vietcong; namely, the idea that we should stop all of our efforts toward free election procedures in September and interfere with the great work being done by Ambassador Lodge and General Westmoreland in Vietnam to bring together these various competing groups in South Vietnam so that we can have the beginning of a meaningful election procedure in September and instead should go to all the trouble of holding a national election on the very issue that the Communists themselves want. Why, we would be asking ourselves, when did we stop beating our wives? Why indeed should we bother to ask the people of Vietnam whether they want to surrender to the Vietcong? Nobody has been burning himself up in Da Nang or Hue in order that the Vietcong might take over. They have been protesting instead so as to get a basis for establishing a free coalition civilian government. And that is precisely what Ambassador Lodge is moving toward. I agree wholeheartedly with the gentleman from Illinois that now that we are winning the war, let us continue in this great House of ours, whatever they may do in another body, to support that war and support our men out there and not try to come up with catchy gimmicks

that play directly into the hands of the enemy, however well meaning they may have been in the first place.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Is it not a fact that while we read about the immolations and various other incidents occurring in Vietnam, behind these sensational events there is actually a tremendously successful effort now being waged at the diplomatic level in conferences between the Catholics, the Buddhists, General Ky, and the other generals? Are they not working very hard over there to try to reach some agreement, and is it not proper to raise some very high hopes that these agreements will indeed be reached and that these elections can be held there, we hope, by September 11 or shortly thereafter, or perhaps even before then?

Mr. STRATTON. That is it exactly. The gentleman is absolutely right. I know he attended with me this morning an extremely helpful, optimistic, and informative briefing by the Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, Mr. Bundy, in which the Members of the House who were there—and I am sorry my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] was not there, because I think he would have been encouraged, too—in which Mr. Bundy outlined for us the steps that have been taken to make these elections possible. As a matter of fact, he suggested to us that he hoped the military junta would be enlarged to take in civilian members. And even before he finished speaking the announcement that that development had actually occurred in Vietnam was on the radio. Let us not rock the boat. Our subcommittee which went to Vietnam during the Easter recess came back as a man and stated to this House that we are indeed winning the military war. And the very fact that we are winning the military war has now led these civilian groups to try to jockey for position in the postwar government that will be formed. Fortunately we are carrying on this delicate political job that the gentleman points out in spite of these demonstrations and immolations by a people which has never had much background in democratic procedures, that never had the opportunity to express their political sentiments in other less violent ways. We are working this out, so let us stick with that effort and not rock the boat in this body; regardless of what may be done in another body.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STRATTON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I can say that I was happy to have been there this morning at that session. I believe that the gentleman is on the Armed Services Committee. Is there any question in the gentleman's mind that we now have taken complete command of the military situation in Vietnam?

Mr. STRATTON. I do not think there is any doubt about it and I would certainly say that victory in a military sense

is entirely likely to come over there a lot earlier than we have been led to believe is possible. I have been surprised, frankly, that the reporting from Vietnam has not reflected this encouraging fact more clearly.

We have focused, as the gentleman said, on the trees instead of the forests in Vietnam, but the word is finally coming through.

Mr. Speaker, I put into the RECORD yesterday an article from the Washington Daily News that not only praised General Westmoreland, and his leadership, but pointed out that under his leadership we are winning the war in Vietnam.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. I would suggest that the gentleman should withdraw from the RECORD his reference to people in Vietnam. I think this is not calculated to serve our purposes or the purposes of free elections of the people in southeast Asia.

Secondly, I would say to the gentleman that he has raised a whole group of straw men but has refused to discuss the specific proposal which I made which is that we should have free, supervised elections, with people who are supervising them whom we can trust, and who have experience and practice and understanding of free elections.

Is the gentleman opposed to this?

Mr. STRATTON. The gentleman knows perfectly well that the real key to victory in Vietnam is to get Vietnam on its own two feet as an independent country.

Mr. GOODELL. But are we not going to have elections?

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further to the gentleman until I can make my point.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield further.

Mr. GOODELL. You do not want a colloquy; you want a soliloquy.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, regular order.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I shall object to further time being granted to the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] should he request it.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman would not yield further to me when he had the time. I am certainly going to try to answer the questions which the gentleman has raised, and then I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman if I have any time left.

Mr. Speaker, the whole purpose of our mission in Vietnam is to establish a free, independent country there, one that can stand on its own two feet, so that we can withdraw our forces from out there when the military victory has been achieved and when the stability of the country has been assured.

Certainly you cannot do that by having some outside force, some foreign country that the gentleman cannot even name, come in there and conduct elections for the Government of Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, what is the essence of the integrity of any country, except its own

tion to use this method of covering operating losses.

Under the proposed legislation we would have three types of loans, or three separate programs, as well as two sources from which money could be obtained. In the absence of any rigid standards for categorizing and classifying the types of facilities proposed, the character of the borrower, and the special conditions involved, it would be most difficult to make any fair and intelligent decision as to which interest rate would apply to the facilities for which the loans would be made. One loan applicant would be played against another, and there would be little the Congress could do about it.

Obviously, the confusion and conflict surrounding the REA Program has reached a point where the country can no longer turn its back on the problem. The legislation which is now being proposed cannot do other than greatly aggravate the difficulties that we have been experiencing. With the two financing sources it will make congressional consideration of the annual program more difficult. It will indefinitely defer the day when the burden can be removed from the Federal Government and the program transferred to true private financing. There is a great need to determine what is to be the proposed future role of the REA co-ops in our pluralistic electric power system. Once this is determined, the ways and means of best accomplishing these ends for the benefit of all concerned can be more easily found and implemented.

The Congress should look carefully into the ramifications of the legislation. Without restrictions and criteria for granting loans by the bank, the funds could be used to serve urban as well as rural areas. And there is more than this involved.

Eight years ago, at their annual meeting, electric cooperatives were handed a so-called blueprint for action. Two of the points in this plan were:

First:

To set up machinery for cooperatives, municipally owned electric systems and power districts to federate more easily for the construction and operation of their own generation and transmission systems . . .

Such systems could be financed under this legislation.

Second:

To establish backbone, common carrier federal transmission grids, or to require others to build them throughout the country . . .

This, too, could be financed under this legislation. I need to point out to no one that with financing by the Federal Electric Bank the plan would create a nationwide, government subsidized power system, wastefully duplicating the facilities of existing suppliers.

The action of the House in appropriating \$365 million for the REA program for fiscal year 1967 will, together with the \$72 million carryover estimated in the budget, provide for one of the highest annual levels of activity ever experienced by this agency. This sum will be more than adequate to take care of needs pending resolution on the many policy issues that need to be answered

before embarking on an entirely new program which is so nebulous in character, need and size as to be beyond comprehension. It is incumbent on the Congress to see that Federal appropriations are made wisely and only for the highest priority purposes. There is no urgency for this legislation. Congress should thoroughly study all of its ramifications before embarking on a new program of this magnitude.

#### NARCOTICS BILL HAS LOOPHOLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK], is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, it is a rare thing to find a legislative enactment by this body that one can agree with 100 percent or oppose 100 percent. The bill we just passed today, the Narcotics Addict Rehabilitation Act, is a good case in point. I think that its provisions are, on the whole, salutary and represent needed emphasis on a critical field in law enforcement.

On the other hand, there is one serious flaw. I believe that it is poor judgment to establish a class of offenders who can escape trial on any theory. If a crime has been committed, the narcotic addict should be brought to trial. If his case warrants rehabilitation in nonpenal surroundings, the judge should have the authority to deal with the case in this manner. I supported all efforts to strengthen this bill and am sorry that the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF] did not pass. His amendment would have removed this one serious defect in this bill.

I supported this legislation because it is my firm belief that it will accomplish much good. On the other hand, this defect should be noted and it is my hope that the Senate will act favorably on these provisions so we will not shunt a group of defendants into a new and different track, forgiving them their crimes without trial. The group so preferred under title I of this bill will be determined not by the process of criminal justice but by the fact of a physical condition—drug addiction—and without any showing whatsoever of connection between the physical condition and the commission of the crime.

#### NICK KOTZ RECEIVES CLAPPER AWARD

(Mr. QUIE (at the request of Mr. GROVER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, it has been a pleasure to see that this year's so-called youth opportunity campaign, especially in the Post Office Department, is being set up on a merit basis. The merit approach replaces the vast patronage system that marked last year's first attempt at the program in the Post Office Department.

I worked hard in the Congress to see that this program, which the President had announced as being designed to provide jobs for needy young people, was im-

proved. At the same time that I was working toward this end in Congress, an outstanding member of the Washington press corps was working for the same goal through the public media.

It is my pleasure to report that this correspondent, Nick Kotz of the Cowles Publications, has received two major American journalism awards as the result of his outstanding work. He has become the recipient of the Sigma Delta Chi award for distinguished Washington reporting and the Raymond Clapper Memorial Award.

During the course of the investigation of impropriety of handling distribution of youth opportunity campaign jobs through the Post Office Department, I had ample opportunity to observe the dedication to his profession, to the truth and to the peoples' right to know which Mr. Kotz displayed. I am honored to join his journalistic colleagues in recognition of his achievement on behalf of the public interest.

Mr. Speaker, following is a copy of the release which the Standing Committee of Correspondents of the Capitol Press Gallery issued following Mr. Kotz' selection as recipient of the Clapper Award.

MONTREAL, May 19.—Nathan K. (Nick) Kotz of the Des Moines Register and the Minneapolis Tribune tonight won the 22nd annual Raymond Clapper Memorial Award for his disclosure in a series of Washington dispatches that summertime anti-poverty jobs were being filled on a patronage basis.

A panel of five prominent newspapermen unanimously selected Kotz "for his comprehensive and discerning reporting" in the best tradition of the late Scripps-Howard columnist, Raymond Clapper.

The award, announced here at the annual banquet of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, carries a cash prize of \$1,000.

From a field of 24 entries the judges also singled out for first honorable mention Dom Bonafede of the New York Herald Tribune, for a series on conflicts of interest among congressmen; and for second honorable mention Ben Price of the Associated Press, for dispatches on government waste, water pollution and the war on poverty.

His citation and check were presented to Kotz by Benjamin R. Cole of the Indianapolis Star, representing the Standing Committee of Correspondents which administers the U.S. congressional press galleries and acts as executive committee of the Raymond Clapper Memorial Association.

The Association makes the award annually to honor Clapper and to foster the kind of Washington reporting that brought him fame as a reporter for United Press, the Washington Post and finally Scripps-Howard. Clapper died in a South Pacific plane crash in World War II.

Kotz, 33, is a native of San Antonio and an honor graduate of Dartmouth College. He has represented the Des Moines Register and the Minneapolis Tribune in Washington since June, 1964.

The award judges said it was a series of Kotz exclusives that broke the story of what they called "subverting" of last summer's youth opportunity program "into a massive handout of congressional patronage."

Others jumped on the story with resulting further disclosures. Congressmen's sons were among those hired. Eventually the White House ordered patronage stopped and the Post Office said future youth hiring would be based solely on merit.

Judges for the award were Glen A. Boissonneault, Editor, the Saginaw News; Grant Dillman, News Editor, Washington Bureau, United Press International; William A. Dyer,



election procedure? And what the gentleman suggested is that the election should be held upon the very issue which the Communists would like to have us think is a big issue, but which our committee overwhelmingly found is not at all a matter of concern for the Vietnamese people.

Mr. Speaker, the Vietcong are today the enemy. They are the terrorists in the mountains. They are cutting off the heads of villagers. The people of Vietnam do not want them running their country. They want the people who are supporting the government and who have tried to defend the countryside, to have a voice in running the country. The gentleman's suggestion would interrupt that whole process, and would have a very bad effect on all the fine progress we are making.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman chooses to characterize my proposal in a very, very unfavorable and unfair way.

What I am suggesting is that members of the gentleman's own party have raised serious doubts in the minds of the people of the world and of the American people about the will of the Vietnamese people and about the desires for an election or determination on the part of the South Vietnamese people to resist aggression.

I think a very clear mandate could be written in an election procedure. I am not suggesting that the election is for this purpose alone. Our Government has committed us. The South Vietnamese Government under Mr. Ky has committed itself to an election, to choose a constituent assembly sometime this year and at the moment it appears to be September.

Mr. STRATTON. It is going to be September.

Mr. GOODELL. This is a very confusing situation.

Mr. STRATTON. It is going to be September 11, unless the gentleman's suggestion confuses the issue too much.

Mr. GOODELL. If the gentleman wants the answer to some of his questions—

Mr. STRATTON. I cannot yield any further as I want to comment upon the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think the South Vietnamese people need have any concern about the determination of our President or about the determination of this House or for that matter about the determination of this country. The only difficulty I am afraid—and I would be the last one to give recommendations to the gentleman—the only difficulty, I think, is that in making his suggestion about a referendum on the Vietcong the gentleman may have been trying to sit on both sides of the fence at the same time.

#### PRODUCTION OF MILK AND DAIRY PRODUCTS

(Mr. RESNICK (at the request of Mr. STRATTON) was granted permission to ex-

tend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, we are so accustomed to agricultural abundance in the United States, that it is almost impossible to believe that food of any kind—particularly a vital and basic commodity like milk—could actually be in short supply. Yet, this is precisely what is happening in this country today. Because I believe that this situation has reached crisis proportions, I have today written the following letter to the Secretary of Agriculture:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., June 1, 1966.

HON. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,  
Secretary of Agriculture,  
Department of Agriculture,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Steps must be taken to increase the production of milk and dairy products in the United States. It may be difficult for most Americans to accept the fact that a shortage of these essential commodities does indeed exist. But this fact is a grim reality.

The evidence is clear and abundant. Milk production in the United States has been sliding down hill for more than a dozen years. In recent months, this slide has become a plunge. March milk production was 7% below the March of one year ago. April production was 4% below last year's. As a matter of fact, last month production reached its lowest level since 1953—a depressing and ominous statistic I am sure you are well aware of. Equally disturbing are the mounting statistics on the mortality of dairy farms, farms which are being disposed of because their owners can no longer afford to keep them.

Strangely, the dairy industry has reached these crossroads of crisis at a time when our population is growing and personal income expenditures, and food consumption have reached record highs. The reason, however, is not hard to figure out. If dairy farmers could make money they would not only remain in business, but would be increasing their production to meet the increasing demand for their product. Somehow the machinery of our farm economy has slipped its gears and—by failing to assure our dairy producers of a proper return on their investment and labor—has caused milk production to fall to the point where we now face serious shortages. The consumer is now paying for this in the form of higher prices for milk, butter, cheese, and other dairy products. For, we see that in the absence of a satisfactory policy in this vital segment of agriculture, both the farmer and the consumer are now being made to suffer.

I call upon the Department of Agriculture, Mr. Secretary, to take immediate steps to turn this dangerous situation around. We can keep our dairy farmers producing. We can prevent them from selling their milk cows for beef. We can get them to expand their herds and increase production to meet the pressing needs of our growing population, as well as export demands. We can once again make the dairy industry a healthy industry. But we can only do these things by establishing and pursuing policies which will guarantee the dairy farmer a decent living. I would suggest that the Department consider giving direct "production payments" to farmers. I think this might be the fastest way of achieving the desired result. This would protect the interest of the farmer by assuring him of enough of a satisfactory return to encourage him to increase his herds and production, and also protect the interests of the consumer by guarantee-

ing him continued abundance of dairy products at reasonable prices.

I urge immediate steps along these lines to prevent the present shortage from developing into what could become a dairy famine in the United States.

With my very best wishes.

Cordially yours,

JOSEPH Y. RESNICK,  
Member of Congress.

#### CAMILLUS CUTLER CO.

(Mr. HANLEY (at the request of Mr. STRATTON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, it was my distinct pleasure to tour the facilities of one of the oldest establishments in my congressional district, the Camillus Cutlery Co. Today I would like to relate to my colleagues some of the interesting background and activities of this firm.

Founded in 1876 by Adolph Kastor, the Camillus Cutlery Co. has soared to a pre-eminence in the manufacture of knives of every variety. When I visited the plant, the employees were engaged in the production of knives and bayonets for our boys in Vietnam and throughout the world. Thousands of GIs in World War II and Korea come to rely on the fighting knives, pocketknives, and bayonets produced at the cutlery. Corpsmen the world over for years have been familiar with Camillus scalpels.

During World War II alone, Camillus Cutlery produced and delivered over 15 million knives for the war effort. For its contribution, the cutlery was the recipient of four Army-Navy "E" awards.

Today the Camillus Cutlery Co. is the sole producer of the Navy and Marine fighting knife.

As Camillus Cutlery makes substantial contributions to our national defense, so also it plays a significant role in our domestic life. Millions of housewives use Camillus products around the house every day, and sportsmen of every variety rely on Camillus knives for hunting, fishing, and recreational purposes.

The president of the cutlery, Nilo Miori, literally grew up with the company. He knows every one of his employees on a personal basis, and his interest in his employees is reflected in the tenure which many of them have achieved. About 45 percent of the employees have been with the company 10 years or more; 23 percent, 20 years or more; 8 percent, 30 years; and several have worked there over 40 years. This solid relationship between employer and employee, between labor and management could well serve as a model for all manufacturing operations.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Camillus Cutlery Co. for its solid record of achievement.

#### EXCLUSION FROM INCOME OF CERTAIN REIMBURSED MOVING EXPENSES

(Mr. McGRATH (at the request of Mr. STRATTON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the

Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with Congressman BURKE in support of his bill, H.R. 13070, which would exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses.

In New Jersey's Second District, which I have the honor to represent, the largest employer is the Federal Aviation Agency, which operates the vast National Aviation Facilities Experimental Center in Pomona, near Atlantic City. Among the thousands of Federal employees assigned to this facility, many are called upon to move into our district on a permanent or semipermanent basis from other FAA facilities, and others are reassigned to FAA installations in all corners of the country. While travel expenses in such cases are reimbursed, these Federal employees are considered for income tax purposes as any privately employed persons, and the current practice of the Bureau of Internal Revenue is to consider this reimbursement of travel expenses as income.

In the cases of these Federal employees, as in the cases of the many privately employed persons in our district and elsewhere in the United States, this works a financial hardship which I feel should be reversed and can be reversed through the terms of H.R. 13070.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I feel it is highly desirable that H.R. 13070's provisions concerning items of expense in addition to the actual cost of moving the employee, his family and household goods to a new place of work, which are clearly nontaxable under present law, be included among the tax exemptions this bill seeks.

Among these are the costs of house-hunting trips of both employee and spouse when both the old and new job locations are within the United States; temporary living expenses at the new employment location while awaiting occupancy of permanent quarters; selling commissions and other expenses incident to the sale of the employee's old residence or to settlement of an unexpired lease on the old residence; out-of-pocket expenses incident to the purchase of a new residence at the new job location, and other miscellaneous expenses directly attributable to the transfer.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly agree with Representative BURKE that enactment of this legislation is essential if years of litigation, confusion, and hardship affecting many thousands of employees are to be avoided.

To emphasize my support for this legislation, I am submitting a bill identical to H.R. 13070, and I will work for its passage in the House of Representatives.

#### AUTO SAFETY AND THE TIRES ON AUTOS

(Mr. TODD (at the request of Mr. STRATTON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I have previously discussed before the House the awful toll of traffic fatalities and in-

juries and the need for prudent and responsible action to cope with this national problem. Basically, there are three factors involved in auto safety: The automobile itself; the driver; and the tires on the automobile.

I believe that the hearings recently held on the subject of auto safety, together with the automobile industry's decision to support a workable auto safety bill, will result in the passage of appropriate legislation this session. With respect to the driver, I believe that State and local governments have become much more aware of the importance of strict licensing, driver education, and tight law enforcement, particularly on drunk drivers. I do not see any need for Federal activity in this area at present. Today, I wish to discuss the third factor—tires on our cars.

At present, there are over 300 million passenger tires in use in the United States. With advances in automobile engineering and the development of our high-speed Interstate Highway System, these tires are subjected to punishment levels virtually unknown 20 years ago. As car owners and drivers, we expect our tires to perform safely under normal load and use conditions, just as we expect to be able to select, on an informed basis, those tires which we wish to buy.

Recent hearings conducted in the House and Senate together with other published evidence suggest that neither of these requirements is at present being fulfilled.

When possible, I prefer to get direct evidence about problems under consideration by Congress. I can report that I have received many letters from constituents in Michigan's Third District complaining about tire safety. Some people reported that their new tires blew out after normal driving and under normal loads, even after a few thousand miles of use. Others reported that even under light load conditions, the two-ply tires sometimes furnished on new cars failed entirely. One man wrote, complaining that he knows of cars leaving the factory equipped with tires whose load capacity is already exceeded by the unloaded curb weight of the car. Another man wrote, noting that he was concerned about the safety of his tires, yet finding that he was completely unable to understand the grading systems used by tire manufacturers.

These reports led me to ask a question about tire safety on my recent congressional questionnaire sent to the citizens of the Third District. The question read:

Do you favor a bill setting minimum safety and performance standards for automobile tires?

	Percent
Yes.....	74
No.....	15
Undecided.....	11

Clearly, the people of my district want action on tire safety.

There appear to be two main problems in the tire field: first, some tires simply are not safe; second, grading systems are confusing and meaningless.

There is strong evidence to show that some tires put on cars are not safe.

There are a number of "grooved" tires sold today, in which the tread has been worn down, and a new tread pattern cut into the rubber; such tires are generally recognized to be very unsafe. Another unsafe type of tire is the "cheapie," a low-priced replacement tire usually sold under an unfamiliar brand name. The Senate Commerce Committee, which held extensive hearings on tire safety, concluded that "significant numbers of these tires were of poor quality often evidencing, upon close inspection, fatal defects and incapable of performing safely under normal conditions of use." Around 20 percent of all tires in service are retreads. Many of these are safe and conscientious products, but some are inferior and unsafe.

It appears that the statements in letters written by my constituents are clearly backed up. Perhaps the most startling piece of evidence regarding tire safety came out recently in testimony given in the superior court of San Francisco, in which a tiremaker was sued for damages in connection with a blowout. One tire expert, chosen by the tire manufacturer, testified that some tires which his company supplies for a leading popular car would be "expected to rupture" if the car were driven with a normal full load. Another expert testified that with as little as a 10-percent overload—and proper loading figures are difficult to find for the average motorist—a tire would be vulnerable to fabric separation, which could take place when a car runs over a chuckhole or a railroad crossing.

The fact that there are unsafe tires on the market, in itself, is no necessary cause for Government action. After all, there are many products of varying degrees of safety in the market, and the consumer should be expected to use proper prudence in making his selection and in maintaining the purchased product. But the situation in the tire market does not allow the consumer to make an informed choice. This is because tire grading standards are either meaningless or so ambiguous as to make informed judgment impossible.

There are, at present, some 950 different tire names currently being marketed, representing approximately 120 private-label marketers and 14 tire manufacturers. The Senate Commerce Committee concluded that there is "no consumer commodity more sharply characterized by confused and misleading nomenclature than the tire." No uniform grading system presently exists. Most tires are sold on the basis of an illusory grading system. Terms such as "premium," "first line," "second line," and "100 level" seem to imply that an objective grading system does exist. In fact, it does not. These designations have no uniform meaning or definite value. One maker's "premium" may be inferior to another's "third line" tire. The so-called "ply ratings" have no fixed meaning. And, according to the Senate committee, the price of a tire has no discernible relation to its grade or safety level.

In this morass of confusing terms, how can the consumer make an informed choice? Should not he be given the facts



June 1, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

11371

production, price and employment so that in that way the copper industry would not be subject to the ups and downs, the booms and busts, which have plagued it over the past several decades.

It is my intention to discuss this matter further with the State Department, and to seek the advice of the copper industry on ways and means to bring about if possible a steady stabilization of the industry on a world-wide basis. As the largest consumer of copper and copper products it is imperative that we face up to this problem of the gap between supplies and demand, and the need for corrective action, to not only bring stability to the industry but to see that its proper markets are maintained and not taken over by substitutes if the price gets too high.

Only last Sunday, copper was selling for 75¢ per pound in small lots in Chile, and according to my information, it is above that price in London and also in certain other areas as well.

This is a situation well worth the creation of a copper study group under U.N. auspices.

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,  
Washington, D.C., May 17, 1966.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: I have considered carefully your letter of May 10, 1966, in which you describe the need for an international stabilization of the world copper market and suggest that the United States take the initiative in calling a world copper conference. I have particularly focused upon the problem to which you advert—namely, that of international cartels in violation of antitrust laws.

If a meeting of producers is contemplated, I can only express my concurrence with the views of my predecessor, Attorney General Kennedy, given in a letter to you dated November 30, 1961, that participation by American copper producers in international conferences designed to allocate production and stabilize prices would be in violation of the antitrust laws.

It may be your proposal did not contemplate such a meeting of producers, but rather a governmental conference for the purpose of seeking solutions to the problems of wide-ranging disparities between available supplies and demand. Governmental conferences to study this problem and international agreements, which duly ratified become the law of the land, of course would not of themselves violate the antitrust laws.

In this connection I should note that since the question of the feasibility of any international governmental effort at diminishing the disequilibria between supply and demand is a complex one, it would require substantial additional study.

Sincerely,

NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH,  
Attorney General.

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, D.C., May 16, 1966.

Hon. MICHAEL J. MANSFIELD,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MIKE: I appreciate your letter of May 10 expressing your views on a world conference on copper. As you know from our many discussions, I am concerned about the copper problems faced by this country and the world. In this connection, I have already directed the U.S. Government to make both immediate and long-range studies of copper under the direction of the Council of Economic Advisers.

I have discussed your proposal with Secretary Rusk and Attorney General Katzenbach. Secretary Rusk informs me that arrangements are being made under the auspices of the U.N. to call an international conference on copper in December of this

year. This may be the best forum for governments to explore the problems of copper and any feasible steps that might be taken to deal with these problems. I have asked Secretary Rusk to get in touch with you to go over what the United States might see as emerging from these discussions, as well as explore other possibilities.

As far as the anti-trust situation is concerned, I have asked the Attorney General to get in touch with you directly on the problems associated with any private international agreements to stabilize the price of copper.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

American Metal Market copper prices, May 26, 1966

	Cents per pound
Domestic producers, delivered U.S. destinations:	
Electrolytic	36.00
Lake	36.00
Foreign electrolytic:	
Chilean, delivered U.S. destination	36.00
Outside United States	62.00
Canadian, delivered U.S. destination	42.00
Overseas	65.00
Zambian, outside United States	75.88
Katangan, c.i.f. New York	72.75
London Metal Exchange, electrolytic wirebar:	
Cash (bid) (£645)	80.63
3 months (bid) (£607½)	75.88
Commodity exchange, standard copper:	
July	72.30
September	69.35
October	67.55
New York merchant market:	
June (nom.)	76.50
July (nom.)	75.50
August (nom.)	74.50
Refiners' No. 2 copper: Scrap (nom.)	57.00

<sup>1</sup> On sales in United States buyer pays 1.7 cents import duty.

<sup>2</sup> Noranda Mines, Ltd.

<sup>3</sup> Anglo American Corp. and Roan Selection Trust.

<sup>4</sup> Union Miniere.

Source: American Metal Market, Friday, May 27, 1966.

## EX-ADMIRAL RADFORD IS WRONG

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, retired Adm. William Radford is not only a rightwing extremist but apparently he is endowed with a vivid imagination. There is no basis in fact for his quoted statement published today in the Washington Post:

It's easy for these Venerables, these Thicks to convince a 17-year-old girl to burn herself up.

Characteristic of the thinking of rightwing extremists, he evidently lacks vision and understanding of the fight for liberation made by the Vietnamese against their French colonial oppressors who, following World War II, violated their word and sought to reestablish their Indochinese empire and to continue to treat the Vietnamese as an inferior subject people. The Vietnamese nationals, led by Ho Chi Minh, fought for liberation and on May 7, 1954, their forces overran the supposedly offensive French colonial outpost at Dienbienphu and that victory led to the withdrawal of 200,000 French soldiers from Vietnam.

Ex-Admiral Radford unfortunately had a position of influence in the then

administration of President Eisenhower as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff from 1953 to 1957. It was he who urged that we use our airpower and paratroopers to relieve Dienbienphu. Fortunately, strong views expressed to President Eisenhower by knowledgeable Senators in very strong terms prevented that grave mistake. Also, Britain's Anthony Eden expressed his dismay and astonishment that President Eisenhower would seriously consider such unilateral action. The United States largely by reason of Admiral Radford's influence at that time spent approximately \$3 billion in military aid to the French Government, whose generals at that time were giving out optimistic statements, "We are winning the war," just as defense Secretary McNamara and other of our leaders in 1963 and 1964 and our generals from their air-conditioned offices in Saigon have proclaimed, "We are winning the war." Now, fortunately, retired Admiral Radford lacks influence in government, so he announces the creation of another rightwing extremist fringe organization, World Youth Crusade for Freedom, Inc. He hopes to send 12 American students "with impeccable academic backgrounds," as he says, to 6 Asian countries to fight Communist political activity this summer; in other words, to seek to interfere in the internal affairs of some 6 Asian countries.

Radford would do his country a greater service if he would refrain from making irresponsible statements lacking basis in fact and from encouraging additional extremist rightwing activities and propaganda.

## INCREASE OF TOLL RATES ON ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the St. Lawrence Seaway Corporation is holding public hearings to consider a 10-percent increase in seaway tolls.

I am opposed to any increase in tolls on the St. Lawrence Seaway. Existing seaway legislation requires that tolls be collected at rates which are fair and equitable, with due consideration to encouraging increased use of the waterway. Any increase in tolls will certainly discourage, not encourage, increased tonnage with a resultant reduction in total revenues. Instead of increasing the tolls charged, it would be more prudent to extend the time within which the debt must be paid to the U.S. Government.

An effective method of increasing the tolls collected under present rates would be for the Federal Government to make greater use of the seaway in the transportation of products, grains, and materials from the interior of the United States to the foreign port destination. The Federal Government has a very real obligation both to utilize the seaway and to promote its use as well.

Instead, however, we find that this is far from the case. The Department of Defense is the world's largest shipper. Yet, despite our best efforts, only very small tonnages of military cargo have moved via the St. Lawrence Seaway. Little American-flag service exists on the Great Lakes, and last year U.S.

11372

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

June 1, 1966

ships carried only 4 percent of the total lake's cargo. Furthermore, the Seaway Corporation, instead of being able to carry on an intensive promotion program to insure full utilization of the seaway and early retirement of the debt, has been unable to utilize funds for effective promotion. Ohio ports—and the opponents of the seaway as well—are fully aware that toll increases will further hamper development of the seaway which is just beginning to be known throughout the world.

Until such time as the Federal Government gives full recognition of the seaway and takes a realistic approach designed to insure its success, I am unalterably opposed to any toll increase.

Mr. President, on September 13 a report was submitted to the Commerce Committee by a special subcommittee that studied the operations of the St. Lawrence Seaway. I was chairman of that subcommittee. I read the specific recommendation that relates to this statement:

## OBSERVATIONS

The subcommittee noted:

1. There is an apparently growing awareness of the advantages of the seaway, as illustrated by—

(a) regular and successive annual increases in tonnage, shipments, and revenues through the seaway;

(b) numerous port improvements undertaken by lake ports since 1959, completed and in the process of construction and planning; and

(c) greatly increased activity by local lake ports in promotion of port traffic and trade.

2. There are indications that the seaway may become self-liquidating in 1 or 2 years and will maintain a level of activity which will enable it to repay its indebtedness within its original 50-year time limitation.

3. It is widely believed that toll increases might depress rather than increase revenues.

Problems were recognized in the areas of—  
1. Channel and harbor depths;  
2. Unavailability of American bottoms at Great Lakes ports;

3. Administration of cargo preference law; and

4. Section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

In relation to the problems which appear to be serious and which are outlined above, this subcommittee believes that the following action should be encouraged:

1. Money should be appropriated to enable the Army Corps of Engineers to complete its program for deepening and clearing Great Lakes channels and harbors to a 27-foot depth. Full utilization of the seaway cannot be expected until this step has been accomplished.

2. There should be a program to utilize American ships for seaway trade.

A transportation axiom, "Ships will go where the cargo is," appears to be untrue on the seaway. After 6 years of operation and a history of increasing cargo each year, the seaway has proven itself as a rich and stable source of traffic and trade. However there is an obvious scarcity of American ships at Great Lakes ports. It must be recognized that the development of inland cargo is not the only answer to the development of American shipping on the Great Lakes. Artificial barrier must be removed. Foremost among these are necessary changes in the administration of the cargo preference laws. The Great Lakes ports should not be combined with the North Atlantic coast ports to determine availability of American bottoms

for Government and foreign aid shipments. This is not logical in terms of geography or economy. It has encouraged the shipowners to rely on the railroads to grant section 22 rates for transportation of cargo to North Atlantic ports, which in turn enables the shipowners to obtain their cargoes at the coastal ports rather than at the Great Lakes ports.

A coordinated effort should be made to establish one authority to administer the cargo preference laws on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway. It appears that the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation should perform this function, which could be implemented with other recordkeeping tasks involving ships and cargoes that transit the seaway.

When traffic has become sufficiently developed, a separate essential trade route should be established to provide direct service between Great Lakes ports and ports in specific overseas foreign areas.

3. Section 22 itself should be examined objectively and changed. It appears to be grossly uncoordinated for the Government to claim that section 22 saves the taxpayers \$50 million per year when it also results in a default to the Government on the seaway's obligation of \$2 million or more annually. Simultaneously it creates uneconomic rates for the railroads which presumably must be made up by private shippers. There was some justification for section 22 when the railroads enjoyed a dominant status in the national transportation picture. Presently, however, they must compete for cargo with other types of transportation and this competition should be on a fair and economic basis. Legislation should be considered to change section 22, to eliminate the preferential treatment accorded to Government traffic. Of course, the Government should retain section 22 privileges in times of national emergency.

4. It appears desirable to lengthen the shipping season on the seaway. The navigation season for the Great Lakes in deep-water areas could easily be extended. In shallow-water areas it would depend entirely upon the severity of the season. In the shallow-water areas additional equipment is necessary to keep the water running faster and to maintain a higher temperature in order to provide for open navigation. This is possible but the cost has not been established. Additional equipment and manpower is necessary at the locks in freezing weather. Presently, steam hoses are used on gates and some flow is maintained to minimize freezing. Cost is involved here also, but the problem can be solved. An all-year-open seaway is not now contemplated. Eventually this may be possible but it is presently unrealistic. Perhaps the seaway season may be extended another 30 days, by opening earlier and closing later, and this appears desirable. Such an improvement would provide a more usable facility and should produce increased revenues.

Promotion is necessary for this venture. The aid of the Canadian Government must be requested and obtained.

5. Studies for future development of the seaway should be undertaken for improved lock facilities. Combination of other waterways, such as the Champlain Waterway, which would provide for a much shorter and more direct ocean passage, should be included in the forward programming of the seaway administration. Many persons, including shippers, shipowners, pilots, and underwriters must be consulted and a program projected under the leadership of the Department of Commerce.

The subcommittee recommends that funds be appropriated to begin the engineering studies.

6. Evidence before the subcommittee has indicated that the growth of the St. Lawrence Seaway will overtax its present facilities

in the early to middle 1970's. This year tonnage is expected to be between 42 and 45 million, which means the waterway is approaching its predicted capacity of 50 million tons. Even assuming the seaway has an actual capacity of 60 million tons, it is necessary to begin planning the expansion of locks and other facilities before the optimum tonnage point is reached.

7. It has been suggested that the amortization period be extended from 50 years to 100 years and that the interest rate be established at 2 percent. It does not appear, in view of the increasing traffic over the seaway in 1964, that this would be necessary, but if relief of this nature were contemplated, it might be more feasible to delay the beginning of the amortization period until a 27-foot depth had been established in all the major lake ports and channels as projected in 1954, when full utilization of the seaway can be accomplished. This in itself should assure sufficient leeway in the amortization schedule to assure proper liquidation of the indebtedness in 50 years.

8. The subcommittee believes that an expanded program of information and promotion should be commenced immediately; the proper organization to facilitate these activities is the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation; the proper person to coordinate and direct these activities is the Administrator of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

9. The subcommittee believes that the St. Lawrence Seaway will not serve the Great Lakes community and the cities contained within its confines in the most advantageous way until greater promotional efforts are undertaken to inform business interests in this country and abroad of the seaway's value. It has been pointed out that promotional activities are a normal, necessary, and an important function in the development of ports and waterways.

These promotional functions of the Seaway Corporation should be encouraged by the Department of Commerce and be included as part of the Seaway Corporation's annual budget, so that the funds expended come from tolls alone and not from appropriated moneys.

## FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, last month I called the attention of the Senate to the fact that President Johnson on December 1, 1965, announced that he was issuing instructions to all Government agencies to reduce Federal civilian employment by at least 25,000 personnel before the end of this fiscal year. At that time I pointed out that in the 4 months following this public endorsement of economy, the administration, instead of reducing employment, had actually added 62,857 more employees.

On Monday, May 30, the Joint Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures issued its monthly report, which shows that during the month of April the administration has added another 33,464 employees. This now brings the grand total of extra employees added in the 5 months following the President's December 1, 1965 announcement to 96,321.

Figuring the Government on a 40-hour workweek this is the equivalent of an average of 875 extra employees being added every day, or an average of 110 per hour—nearly 2 a minute—since he made the grandstand announcement that he was going to reduce Federal employment.



11384

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Notwithstanding a number of political and economic problems, the 650,000 people of this new nation have proceeded along the road to independence with moderation and good sense. Most heartening, in particular, has been the fact that the overwhelming majority of the people have rejected the Communist alternative. Much of this success is due to the fair minded leadership of Guyana's Prime Minister, Mr. Forbes Burnham, who is doing much to ease the tensions between the Negro and Indian sectors of Guyana.

In honoring this new nation I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two editorials, one published in the Washington Post and the other in the New York Times on May 26, 1966.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 26, 1966]

#### WELCOME TO GUYANA

A mere two years ago British Guiana seemed among the least promising of the recent multitude of candidates for independence. A strike abetted by the Marxist Prime Minister, Dr. Cheddi Jagan, was paralyzing the country. Racism was rampant, with frightening clashes between the urban Africans and the East Indians who now constitute a majority of the 640,000 people. The United States was fearful of a new Castroite stronghold and had impressed its concern on Britain.

That Guyana has nevertheless qualified as an independent commonwealth nation today is a remarkable success story. In part it is due to a firm but enlightened British Governor, Sir Richard Luyt, who stays on by Guyanese request as the first Governor General. In part it is due to the system of proportional representation devised by Britain that permitted the present coalition to break Dr. Jagan's hold. In part it is due to substantial economic aid. But mostly it is due to the emergence of a fair-minded African Prime Minister, Forbes Burnham, who has been trying hard to heal the past racial cleavages and win the confidence of all segments of the population.

Some caveats remain. Guyana is highly literate and is potentially rich in resources, but unemployment and renewed racial friction could mar the prospect. The country is still fragile, and much depends upon restraint. But the augury today is good. Dr. Jagan has ended his boycott to lead the opposition. Mr. Burnham has coupled action with forbearance, and an opportunity exists for Guyana to play a leading part in forming a regional market with other former British territories in the Caribbean. A salute to independent Guyana is in order.

[From the New York Times, May 26, 1966]

#### GUYANA AT INDEPENDENCE

British Guiana has achieved independence as Guyana with two major problems threatening an otherwise hopeful future. They are the danger of racial strife between the country's 200,000 Negroes and the 320,000 Guyanese of East Indian origin, and the threat posed by the Marxist leader of the opposition People's Progressive party, Dr. Cheddi B. Jagan.

Guyana starts out on its own with more assets than many former colonies achieving statehood. Its literacy rate—more than 80 percent—is probably the highest of any underdeveloped country in the world, and provides the material from which to fashion the skilled work force required for economic viability and stability. Its numbers of doc-

tors, engineers, architects, accountants and other professional people are not large in absolute terms for a country of 650,000, but large enough to give Guyana much better prospects than many new nations of Asia and Africa.

Guyana has had a small foreign trade surplus in recent years and its national debt is less than \$150 million. The coalition Government of Prime Minister Forbes Burnham has done much to clean up the financial mess left in 1964 by the Jagan regime. Mr. Burnham's Government has adopted liberal tax policies aimed at attracting private foreign investments.

But the facts remain that most Guyanese of East Indian extraction, who make up half the population, continue to support Dr. Jagan and that his party controls the biggest bloc of seats in the Assembly.

Unless Mr. Burnham's party is able over the long run to add substantial East Indian elements to its Negro base, it will be very difficult even under present election arrangements to keep Dr. Jagan on the sidelines indefinitely. The possibility of another Castro-type regime in the Western Hemisphere thus will continue to haunt the United States and other American countries for some time.

#### VIETNAM REPORT BY A DIRECTOR OF THE INTERNATIONAL RESCUE COMMITTEE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Mr. William J. Casey, a director of the International Rescue Committee and a member of its Vietnam subcommittee, has recently returned from Vietnam and has written a well-balanced and provocative account of his observations.

Mr. Casey's observations and proposals are in many ways in accord with my own views of the Vietnam situation. Mr. Casey confirms the judgments I made during my trip to Vietnam several months ago on a number of counts: First, that the majority of the Vietnamese people clearly oppose a Communist takeover; second, that no political faction in South Vietnam really desires the withdrawal of the U.S. presence; and third, that not nearly enough is being done by either the Saigon government or our own Government to meet the requirements of social and economic reconstruction of this country. Mr. Casey writes:

The primary battle in Vietnam is to help a people brought up under colonialism establish a working independent government and to help them meet their basic needs.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Casey's report printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### NOTES ON A TRIP TO VIETNAM AND A PROPOSAL (By William J. Casey)

I have just had the privilege of visiting Vietnam as a director of the International Rescue Committee, as a member of its Executive Committee and as a member of its Vietnam subcommittee. I visited refugee camps, orphanages, hospitals and dispensaries all over the country. I received briefings from our military and civilian advisers in several provinces. It has been inspiring to see the great humanitarian work of IRC and other American voluntary agencies working in Vietnam. Our military and USAID officials there are similarly dedicated.

I traveled by helicopter over most of the Delta of the Mekong River, I traveled over

most of the coastal area as far north as Quang Ngai, in Military Zone I, I traveled over most of the central highlands, from Dak To down through Kontum and Pleiku. I talked to our military leaders, our economic and civilian leaders, leading figures in the government of South Vietnam.

It is easy to get alarmed about the situation in Vietnam as you sit here in New York and read the papers, listen to the radio, see the TV and talk to all the grandstand quarterbacks. I return from Vietnam greatly encouraged. We have big problems, we may experience setbacks. We can question the wisdom which got us where we are. But we are there and we must face it. And we can take heart from these encouraging elements:

1. There is no political leader of any importance at all who shows any sympathy for the Viet Cong.

2. No political faction wants a government in which the Viet Cong would play any important role.

3. No political faction wants us out.

4. No one believes that the National Liberation Front, representing the Viet Cong and its sympathizers (the Viet Cong being controlled by the Communist organism of North Vietnam) would pull more than 10% of the vote in a national election in South Vietnam.

5. No important city in South Vietnam has ever been held by the Viet Cong. They have dominated and terrorized much of the countryside, but they have no influence where the great bulk of the people live.

6. The refugees, whether they flee a Viet Cong attack, or an attack by force of the South Vietnamese government or by U.S. forces, come only one way—toward us and away from the Viet Cong.

7. 2,000 of the Viet Cong accept the open arms or amnesty invitation of the South Vietnamese government and defect every month.

I was in Vietnam to study the problem of helping the refugees and the victims of war. And this war is primarily a contest to win the allegiance of these people, in showing them that we can help them to a better life.

Although lives are being lost, we are primarily engaged in helping a people enter the 20th century. To do this, we have to help the government of South Vietnam fight off an armed insurrection, aided and abetted by other countries, which is seeking to disrupt economic and social progress and take over the country. Sometimes we do this directly. Perhaps we get a better perspective when we realize that we are helping a nation of 16 million people and, to do so, we must fend off a force of some 200,000 outlaws—some 80,000 regular hard core Viet Cong who fight and disrupt, and some 120,000 sympathizers who do militia and guard duty.

We went into Vietnam to help the South Vietnamese people develop their economy, create a government and build a nation. That is still our primary purpose. To carry it out, we have had to help the South Vietnamese government police their country and protect their civil and social and economic affairs from violent disruption and intrusion by armed dissidents, supported and directed from outside their country. These armed bandits have spread terror throughout the countryside, taxed the country people illegally, blasted over 500,000 people out of their homes, created mass movements of refugees and orphans throughout the country, assassinated some 15,000 village officials, teachers and other leaders in the 16,000 villages which make up South Vietnam.

I believe we are doing well in Vietnam. There will be trials and setbacks. But it is inspiring to see young Americans, 25 and 30, teaching and leading the Vietnamese into the 20th century. Their eyes and their efforts are focused on conquering, not the Viet Cong, but hunger and disease and ignorance. The Viet Cong is a nuisance which must be fended off, somewhat like the

## U.S. contributions to the United Nations, specialized agencies, and special programs

	Calendar year 1963			Calendar year 1964 (estimated)			Calendar year 1965 (estimated)		
	U.S. contribution	Percent	Per capita cost	U.S. contribution	Percent	Per capita cost	U.S. contribution	Percent	Per capita cost
United Nations <sup>1</sup>									
Food and Agriculture Organization	\$33,379,925	32.02	\$0.176	\$29,314,390	32.02	\$0.154	\$32,867,300	31.91	\$0.168
Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization	4,591,668	32.02	.024	5,702,604	32.02	.030	5,688,353	32.02	.029
International Civil Aviation Organization	50,445	14.14	.001	54,475	14.26	.001	113,216	13.78	.001
International Labor Organization joint financing program	1,452,373	31.80	.007	1,445,638	31.80	.007	1,561,935	31.80	.008
International Telecommunication Union	1,117,686	33.18	.006	1,297,388	34.94	.006	1,150,799	34.94	.006
United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization	3,501,709	25.00	.019	4,097,199	25.00	.021	4,671,087	25.00	.024
Universal Postal Union	366,850	10.09	.002	362,035	10.01	.002	406,646	9.99	.002
World Health Organization	5,383,500	30.56	.028	5,806,400	30.56	.030	6,881,980	30.00	.035
World Meteorological Organization	30,864	4.21		43,574	4.30		48,745	4.30	
United Nations and specialized agencies	9,611,280	31.12	.051	10,852,040	31.29	.057	12,327,120	31.29	.063
United Nations Emergency Force:	169,118	18.91	.001	342,605	24.01	.002	407,052	23.09	.002
Assessed	59,655,427	31.15	.315	59,311,848	31.09	.310	66,115,133	30.93	.339
Voluntary	3,037,040			5,664,856			5,485,000		
UNEF total	371,846			871,905			850,000		
United Nations operation in the Congo:	2,408,486	35.88	.018	6,536,761	36.82	.034	6,335,000	36.82	.032
Assessed	10,549,720			4,787,202					
Voluntary	1,768,479			704,111					
UNOC total	12,318,199	37.33	.065	5,491,313	30.17	.029			
United Nations Force in Cyprus, voluntary	2,408,486	35.88	.018	7,596,450	46.06	.040	2,400,000	34.40	.021
United Nations peacekeeping	15,726,785	37.02	.083	19,624,524	38.34	.103	10,335,000	35.88	.053
United Nations Children's Fund	12,000,000	42.00	.064	11,809,417	40.00	.062	12,000,000	40.00	.061
United Nations economic assistance to the Congo	29,400,000	56.00	.156	5,000,000	56.00	.026	5,000,000	56.00	.026
United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, Egyptian monuments program	21,619,891	40.00	.114	22,508,500	33.33	.063	22,500,000	40.00	.115
United Nations expanded program of technical assistance	30,798,784	40.00	.162	30,491,500	40.00	.191	37,500,000	40.00	.192
United Nations Special Fund	1,200,000	40.00	.006	2,438,006	40.00	.013	1,361,904	40.00	.007
United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization: World food program	700,000	24.30	.004	600,000	33.33	.003	600,000	33.33	.003
United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees program	24,700,000	70.00	.131	24,700,000	70.00	.129	24,700,000	70.00	.127
United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East	500,000	100.00	.003				100,000	20.00	.001
World Health Organization, medical research program	120,918,675	60.37	.640	115,547,513	46.38	.605	103,761,904	47.85	.532
United Nations special programs	196,300,887	43.46	1.039	194,483,885	40.02	1.018	180,212,037	40.96	.924
Total									

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect repayment received on U.N. bonds.  
<sup>2</sup> Covers 6 months of the year.

<sup>3</sup> The amount shown includes the airlift services of \$906,450 and cash contributions for 9 months of the year.

## A LETTER FROM A SERVICEMAN IN VIETNAM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it has always been my belief, buttressed by my trip to South Vietnam last January, that despite divisions of opinion here in the United States, our men in Vietnam clearly understand and support U.S. policies toward Vietnam and that their morale is high. This kind of support from our fighting men in Vietnam gives the necessary encouragement to those in high places who are responsible for making the difficult choices between war and peace.

I am particularly pleased to have received a letter from Raymond Alger, a member of the Coast Guard serving in the Republic of South Vietnam. He writes:

I'm merely an American doing what must be done—and I believe in what I am doing.

Mr. Alger's very eloquent letter is testimony to the fact that those who are on the scene in Vietnam recognize the vital purposes for which we all struggle. I ask unanimous consent to have his letter printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

No. 90—11

MAY 24, 1966.

Mr. SENATOR: I'm presently serving with the United States Coast Guard in the Republic of Vietnam. My home lies several thousand miles away in the small town of Middleburgh, New York and, upon my return, I would consider it a pleasure to personally thank you for your recent stand on the President's policy in Vietnam.

Since my arrival in Vietnam, it has ostensibly been shown to me the American serviceman's willingness to aid the Vietnamese in every conceivable way imaginable. Will fight for him but even more so, will try to better him and thusly, better his country.

I fully realize that public opinion within the States will invariably dictate the actions our government must take over here. Label these individuals "armchair generals" and hear them out, but also, hear out one of those so-called "unfortunates who has literally been thrown into the caldron." Such a hyperbolic title. I'm merely an American doing what must be done—and I believe in what I'm doing.

As you well know, the Vietnamese people have been suppressed for years by the omnipotent powers which have ruled their country, intimidated by the VC and now, confronted with true freedom, they're confused and anxious in their obtaining it.

First and foremost, the various sects must be united by the people themselves. Once this unity is achieved, a nationalistic spirit will prevail and the VC will be driven from the country by our joint offensive. Until

these personal differences are overcome however, we must and will be patient.

True, we're fighting a war in which good American men are paying with their lives, but even more so, we're winning the hearts and minds of the people by social economic and political reform efforts.

If I were to be one of those who was chosen to follow my predecessors in "Glory Hall," at least I would go believing in our course as do so many of the servicemen over here. After all "... resistance to tyranny is obedience to God." We must not withdraw and leave these people to the ultimate destruction the VC will impose on them!

Thank you again Mr. Senator for backing our President and the boys over here in Vietnam. Your views on U.S. policy prove you to be appreciative of the American ideals and you will always supersede those who, with statements containing allegations and vituperations tend to do us all a shameful injustice.

Respectfully yours,

RAYMOND ALGER, GM 2, USCG.

## INDEPENDENCE FOR GUYANA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to extend welcome and congratulations to the new state of Guyana. After 152 years of colonial life under the name of British Guiana, Guyana has attained independence.



June 1, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

11335

malaria-bearing mosquito, in order to get the job done.

In the United States, we have one doctor for every 800 people. In Vietnam, there is one doctor for every 50,000 civilians, one dentist for every 250,000 people, one fully trained nurse for every 80,000 people. Our military men and their civilian running mates, serving the Vietnam government, are overcoming this appalling shortage. Doctors from the free world, and refugee doctors from Cuba are coming in to provide medical services at hospitals and dispensaries located at provincial capitals and other cities. Vietnamese girls are being trained to visit schools and families and refugee camps, to give injections, to spot cases that need the attention of the doctors at the nearest dispensary or hospital. The Vietnam people are beginning to realize that their government is acting to give their children and themselves a healthier future.

Let me repeat this. The primary battle in Vietnam is to help a people brought up under colonialism establish a working independent government and to help them meet their basic needs. The secondary battle is to protect this peaceful work of nation building from disruption by violent insurrection carried on by less than 2% of the population. With all the news of military battle, it is difficult to grasp this relationship. It is not easy to tell the people that the work of arms is secondary while men are being shot at. But if we are to succeed in Vietnam, if we are to avoid a bigger war, it is essential to grasp this relationship. On this score, two things are encouraging:

1. The record shows that the work of pacification is one of our most effective military weapons. Each month, some 2,000 of the Viet Cong lay down their arms and come over to our side. This comes partly from our show of strength, partly from the demonstration that the South Vietnam government can do more to help these men and their families than the Viet Cong can.

2. That the civilian front is primary is firmly believed by the thousands of Americans, military and civilian, who are helping refugees, training civil servants, training nurses and teachers, resettling refugees on new land and training them in mechanics and woodworking and construction.

At the moment, American and Vietnam forces command the military situation. We are able to move almost anywhere in South Vietnam with relatively small forces. In one populous province in the north, considered to be hot and strong in Viet Cong, the senior American military adviser believes that we can go anywhere and take any town in the province with two companies, or 300 men. In the central highlands, some 4,000 men cleared out a 60 mile front in 18 days. In the Delta, with some 2,500 Special Forces troops, we are securing 100 miles of the Cambodian border.

We have the mobility, the fire power and the fighting power to substantially clear the country, unless Ho Chi Minh or the Chinese put in more regular troops. What we need and don't have is the force to hold the territory we take. This creates a seesawing back and forth. The Marines clear out a pocket of Viet Cong and go back to their base and, then, the Viet Cong come back in. This is costly in lives and disruption of civilian life. We should use our military superiority to clear the country while we have it and we should get the forces to hold the territory we clear. This will accelerate the nation-building process and bring many Viet Cong, with their families, over to our side as it becomes clearer that we can offer them more security, food, education and health care.

To continue with too little and too late at this stage will be too costly.

As to what to do about involving the Vietnamese at this juncture, I recommend the following:

1. Put top priority on extending the portion of South Vietnam which the government holds securely. The government presently holds well under half the country side, but those areas in which well over half the population resides. We can and should hold the entire Delta, the entire coastal area and all the cities and farming areas in the central highlands. Only when we have done this can we successfully and securely build a government and an economy which can satisfy the Vietnamese people. When we have done this, we will have successfully repulsed this Communist inspired war of national liberation and will, hopefully, have dealt a death blow to the war of liberation technique with which the Chinese and the Russians threaten to undermine us throughout Asia, Latin-America and Africa.

2. Don't extend and escalate the war. Continue to bomb supply depots and supply lines in order to reduce the flow of supplies which can be used against our men, but do not send ships in or mine Haiphong harbor or bomb the population of Hanoi. To escalate the war in this way could involve us in a major land war in Asia. It could force the North Vietnamese to send against our men the 300,000 trained troops they now have in North Vietnam. The advantages of shutting off Haiphong harbor are not enough to justify the risk of involving us in a much greater war. Any supplies which come in to Haiphong harbor can be brought in over land if Haiphong harbor is out of commission. Thus, the advantages of disrupting international shipping in Haiphong harbor are temporary and illusory. Supplies are coming into South Vietnam on bicycles. We can only cut that off by bombing or otherwise interdicting jungle trails. If supplies don't come in through Haiphong harbor, they would come down from Hong Kong or Shanghai or overland from Manchuria and Russia. It is irresponsible for anyone, who is not in a position to weigh the benefits against the risk and exposure of bombing, mining or blockading Haiphong harbor, to urge that we take any of these drastic steps.

3. Get additional holding forces in Vietnam so that our present ability to defeat the Viet Cong in the field, root them out of the towns and chase them into the hills can be converted into additional securely held territory in which the process of helping the Vietnamese people in building the nation can be prosecuted. The Australians have just tripled their commitment of troops. The Philippines are taking legislative action to send holding forces. We should accelerate diplomatic initiative to get other nations to contribute holding forces. In Europe, we should offer technological assistance to induce our allies there to either send troops or civilian personnel to aid in the process of developing the Vietnamese nation. Above all, we should urge the government of South Vietnam to develop a more effective method of allocating manpower to the military and essential civilian functions, and we should exert very great pressure to get them to put the young men, now riding bicycles on the streets of Saigon and the other cities, into uniform so that the American capacity to clear out the Viet Cong can be followed up by holding operations in which these new Vietnamese troops can be trained and converted into a fighting force.

4. Get more young men from the United States and other free nations involved in the process of helping Vietnamese refugees, and fighting ignorance, poverty and hunger in Vietnam. Much of this vital work is now being done by ex-Peace Corps men. We have made a policy decision not to use the Peace Corps in Vietnam. Apparently, there's concern that helping the civilian population in South Vietnam would impair the image of the Peace Corps as a force for peace. This is a weak and self-conscious posture and we should reverse it to use Peace Corps person-

nel in the process of nation building in South Vietnam. Failing that, we should recruit men from the Peace Corps and young volunteers from America, who would otherwise go into the Peace Corps, to accelerate our efforts on a civilian front in South Vietnam.

5. We should support our troops in South Vietnam but we should not permit political decisions which would or could involve extension of the war to military commanders. These decisions should continue to be made only by our duly elected political leaders.

6. Don't permit the military pressures or the harassment of the Viet Cong to hold us back from our essential task in Vietnam, which is to help build the nation, create a viable Vietnamese government and help the long-suffering people of that land. That's the only way we will, in the final analysis, win the war and show the Communist powers that the technique of national wars of liberation, on which they count to destroy our influence throughout the world, does not work.

7. Continue to make every possible diplomatic initiative to work out a peaceful settlement. There can be no peaceful settlement on South Vietnam unless the Viet Cong participate. The Viet Cong organization is directed from North Vietnam. But many of its members could be persuaded to join in the government and society of South Vietnam. This is evident from the fact that presently some 2,000 of the Viet Cong accept the open arms invitation of the government of South Vietnam and defect every month. The elections scheduled for September offer a great opportunity to accelerate this process.

## A PROPOSAL

I propose that the U.S. Government urge the South Vietnamese to challenge the Viet Cong with a new double-barrelled military-political drive. This initiative should be dramatically focused on the upcoming elections in Vietnam. The military aspect of this double-barrelled policy cannot be divorced from diplomatic aspects.

The first half is military:

We now have the mobility and the military capacity and control of the air necessary to take almost any portion of South Vietnam. But we are not able to substantially increase the land area and the number of villages that the South Vietnamese hold because there are not sufficient local troops to hold the areas liberated by our effective mobile forces. The South Vietnamese must substantially up their draft and put more of their eligible males into armed service. These new South Vietnamese troops can be deployed to hold newly liberated territory and while there can receive additional training and begin to learn the more intricate offensive maneuvers of jungle warfare. This added South Vietnamese troop deployment would help eliminate the frustrating experience American forces now have to endure when they liberate a village only to know that, when they return to their base the Viet Cong will come back and capture the village. It would also protect the civilian people and refugees from being caught in a seesawing of territory between the South Vietnamese forces aided by Americans and the Viet Cong.

The second half of this double-barrelled policy is diplomatic and political:

The upcoming election should be the basis of a major peace initiative which, even if it fails to terminate hostility, should reduce the numbers and the effectiveness of the Viet Cong.

The Americans and South Vietnamese Government should offer to the Viet Cong an opportunity to participate as a political party in the forthcoming elections providing they cease their aggression and violence. This should be backed up by a strong offer of amnesty to the Viet Cong people insuring them, as individuals, the right to participate in the

11386

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

June 1, 1966

elections in return for their coming over to the South Vietnamese side. I believe this will substantially increase the number of defections from the Viet Cong which is already running over 2,000 per month.

In summary, I believe that we and the South Vietnamese must show the Viet Cong that they are in for a tougher time, yet hold the door open for them as a party to negotiate for a role in the elections should they renounce force, and as individuals to participate in the new elections if they choose to join the free Vietnamese. This kind of initiative offers the only present hope of producing an early peaceful settlement. The diplomatic effort would show the world our peaceful purposes while the military effort would not permit our peace seeking efforts to be misinterpreted as weakness. It should, as a minimum, step up the rate of defections from the Viet Cong. It would offer added protection to the people of South Vietnam and accelerate the basic nation building program which is necessary for a durable peace in Southeast Asia.

## UNFAIR FEDERAL AID

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on March 5 I issued a study, which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 8, of the distribution of Federal grants-in-aid among the States. My conclusion from that study was that the distribution of such funds to States, local governments, and private institutions is "grossly unfair to large urban States."

It has come to my attention that an excellent editorial supporting the study was published in the Syracuse Herald-Journal on March 19, 1966. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## UNFAIR FEDERAL AID

Sen. JACOB JAVITS has rolled up his congressional sleeves and has picked a fight with the federal aid formulas which he labeled as being "out of date, arbitrary and grossly unfair to large urban states."

He speaks so true when he calls these times the "age of the cities", for there have been enormous shifts of population into major urban centers. The self-taxing efforts of these cities cannot meet the vastly-rising demands for services and sharply increased costs. But not enough Federal money has come along in wake of these population waves of pressure.

Listen to Sen. JAVITS:

"The huge concentrations of population in major urban centers have created conditions entirely beyond the proportions ever experienced before. These are conditions which threaten the basic livability of the dwelling place of almost 75 per cent of our nation's people.

"And they are conditions which the cities and the states in which they are located are incapable of handling with their available resources. Only the federal government can help do this job; without the federal government, the cities are strangling."

Much of this injustice is apparent through the whole panorama of the hundred or so aid grants to states—the allocations for hospital and medical facilities construction aid, vocational rehabilitation, roads, economic development, pollution, education, health services and so on.

What makes it so unfair is that, for every dollar in federal income tax paid by New Yorkers, only 54 cents is returned. This state contains 9.4 per cent of the national population. It receives only seven per cent of all federal aid distributed to the states.

JAVITS wants Washington to keep up with the changing face of the nation but, instead, he laments, "we have perpetuated a benefit for the less-populated states without considering whether it still is relevant."

Let's hope JAVITS' fellow senators listen to him and understand the terrible financial strain today on cities . . . and move to divide federal aid to reflect urban needs.

THE 12TH ANNUAL REPORT OF  
DELINQUENT TAXES

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today I am filing the 12th annual report of delinquent taxes.

The 1965 report shows an increase in delinquent employment taxes from \$217,365,000 to \$222,296,000, representing a 2.3-percent increase. The total amount of all delinquent taxes—employment, income, corporation, et cetera—have increased 7.9 percent or from \$1,173,911,000 to \$1,267,183,000.

In addition to the delinquent taxes as carried on the books at the end of 1965 the report shows that during the calendar year 1965 the Government wrote off as uncollectible, delinquent accounts totaling \$328,275,000. This writeoff represents a 61-percent increase over the \$203,821,000 written off as uncollectible in 1964. In addition, the amount of taxes abated in 1964 jumped 68.5 percent, from \$177,772,000 to \$299,629,000 in 1965.

A statistical breakdown showing the valuations in delinquent accounts, writeoffs, and abatements for each of the various collection districts will be incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. I shall cite but a few of the more glaring examples.

The Brooklyn, N.Y., office shows a 45.4-percent increase in delinquent employment taxes and a 29.8 percent increase in total tax delinquencies. In addition, the report for the Brooklyn office shows a substantial increase in the amount of delinquent accounts written off as uncollectible and that this writeoff jumped from \$12,917,000 in 1964 to \$18,094,000 in 1965. During the same year taxes abated jumped from \$6,958,000 in 1964 to \$20,585,000.

The Manhattan office shows an increase in total tax delinquencies of 11.1 percent or an increase from \$132,398,000 to \$147,058,000, but this tells only a small part of the story. The Manhattan office wrote off an additional \$97,916,000 as uncollectible accounts. This represents almost a 275-percent increase from the \$26,418,000 written off in 1964. During this same year the amount of taxes abated in the Manhattan office jumped 74.5 percent, from \$12,049,000 in 1964 to \$21,025,000 in 1965.

Unquestionably both the Brooklyn and the Manhattan offices need attention. The unusually large amounts being written off need further explanation.

The Baltimore, Md., office reports a drop in total tax delinquencies from \$23,541,000 to \$21,938,000, but apparently this drop is partly accounted for by a substantial increase in the total amount of delinquent taxes written off as uncollectible. The Baltimore office in 1965 wrote off as uncollectible \$10,804,000, an increase of 204.8 percent from the \$3,545,000 written off in 1964. During

the same period taxes in the amount of \$5,409,000 were abated as compared with \$4,609,000 abated in 1964.

Newark, N.J., reported \$59,407,000 in total tax delinquencies, representing a 6-percent increase over 1964. Again the amount of delinquent accounts written off as uncollectible jumped from \$7,327,000 in 1964 to \$18,273,000 in 1965, an increase of 150 percent. During this same year the amount of taxes abated jumped from \$10,934,000 in 1964 to \$19,344,000 in 1965.

The Philadelphia office reported the total amount of delinquent taxes as being \$38,316,000, an increase of 4.3 percent over 1964, but delinquent accounts written off as uncollectible in the Philadelphia office totaled \$17,126,000 as compared to \$14,354,000 in 1964. Taxes abated in the Philadelphia office dropped from \$12,768,000 in 1964 to \$7,552,000 in 1965.

Wilmington, Del., reported a 102.0 percent increase in delinquent employment taxes, a jump from \$294,000 in 1964 to \$594,000 in 1965, but it had a 16.2 percent decrease in total delinquent accounts as compared to 1964, a reduction from \$5,163,000 to \$4,326,000. Delinquent accounts written off as uncollectible, however, jumped from \$405,000 in 1964 to \$1,044,000 in 1965. Taxes abated during this same year declined from \$2,450,000 to \$1,437,000.

In Jacksonville, Fla., delinquent employment taxes rose 6.9 percent, from \$9,743,000 to \$10,412,000, while the total amount of all tax delinquencies in this office jumped 95.2 percent, from \$50,334,000 in 1964 to \$98,275,000 in 1965. During the same period the Jacksonville office wrote off delinquent accounts as uncollectible totaling \$11,529,000 as compared to \$10,708,000 in 1964. Taxes abated in the Jacksonville office in 1965 totaled \$5,766,000 as compared with abatements in 1964 of \$8,526,000.

Chicago, Ill., reports a 12.1-percent increase in delinquent employment taxes, or \$10,073,000 in 1965 as compared to \$8,985,000 in 1964. During the same period the total tax delinquencies in the Chicago office jumped 18.2 percent, or from \$43,164,000 to \$51,012,000 in 1965. During the same year delinquent accounts written off as uncollectible in the Chicago office totaled \$20,733,000 in 1965, an increase of 68.9 percent, or from \$12,277,000 written off in 1964. In 1965 taxes abated in this office totaled \$6,583,000 as compared to \$6,866,000 in 1964.

Milwaukee, Wis., reported a 7-percent reduction in delinquent employment taxes and a 21.8 percent increase in total tax delinquencies, or an increase in total delinquent taxes from \$8,836,000 to \$10,758,000 in 1965. During the same year, however, the Milwaukee office wrote off \$3,588,000 in delinquent accounts as uncollectible, representing an increase of 193.1 percent over the \$1,224,000 written off as uncollectible in 1964. Taxes abated in this office were \$2,149,000 in 1965 as compared to \$2,016,000 in 1964.

Dallas, Tex., reported that it had reduced its total tax delinquencies by 13.3 percent, or from \$23,588,000 to \$20,446,000; however, delinquent accounts written off as uncollectible in the Dallas of-

June 1, 1966

11396

to meet this assistance challenge could only produce additional breeding grounds for the infestation and eventual domination of these countries in the world plan for communist control.

This problem of world hunger is lessening. Every 24 hours, world population is increasing by about 170,000 people and every year by about 65 million, or about the number of people who populate France.

One of the nations regularly visited with famine and death from hunger during our generation is India. Madame Ghandi, that nation's prime minister, was in Washington recently conferring with the President on the food needs of that nation. Since independence, India has made great strides, increasing her food production by about 75 percent, but the failure of the monsoon last year has made her the victim of merciless natural disaster. This terrible agricultural tragedy is compared to our own "dust bowl" years of the 1930's.

In answer to India's desperate request for assistance, President Johnson has asked that we increase our planned six millions tons of food grain destined for India. But man does not live by bread alone, and scientists are consistently reminding us of this literal truth.

Dr. Roger Revelle, Director of the Center for Population Studies at Harvard University, and a native of our own State of Washington recently emphasized the problems of India when he said:

"The future of mankind is now being ground out in India. If there is no solution, all the world will live like India does now. A livable world cannot long exist where two-thirds don't have enough to eat and one-third are over fed—and that is the present world."

Dr. Revelle recommends an attack on the food crisis on four fronts, and one of these is in the need for increasing the quality of diets, with particular emphasis on protein. One of Dr. Revelle's solutions toward the increment of high quality protein is found in the development of low-cost protein extract from fish.

If Fish Protein Concentrate were available today in sufficient quantities, the addition of just a small percentage in that six million tons of wheat which the President has promised to India, would mean the difference in merely keeping people alive, and making them able to perform the functions necessary to make this product a world reality.

Our path thus far toward such reality has not been an easy one. An opinion some years ago in which the Federal Food and Drug Administration rejected Fish Protein Concentrate because it was made from whole fish has made progress slow and difficult. The present application from the Department of Interior for approval of Fish Protein Concentrate is not only achieving sympathetic consideration, but there is considerable optimism that it will be granted. The approval if granted, however, will be for only one process and for only one type of fish. There is need for rapid and broadened research and process development, and the legislation which we have considered in hearing today is intended to assist such accomplishment.

One of the distinct advantages of Fish Protein Concentrate is its low cost. Scientists estimate that just a teaspoonful of this tasteless, odorless product can produce noticeable good result in a child suffering from protein malnutrition disease in less than ten days, and the cost is estimated to be about twenty-five cents per month.

Many food scientists are looking to the ocean resources today as the greatest hope for the survival of mankind. The challenge which we face is to duplicate in terms of food production within the next 35 years everything that mankind has learned and achieved since the beginning of time, and the key word to the challenge is the word

"time". We are in a race against time. Those who suggest an agricultural solution to world hunger have suggested the reclamation of new lands. But their cost estimates reach the staggering figure of nearly half a trillion dollars.

#### WORLD FISHERY CONSERVATION IMPERATIVE

In terms of time and cost it is little wonder that nations are turning to the sea. In 1850 the world catch was less than two million tons; in 1900 it had more than doubled to 4 million tons, by 1930 it was 10 million tons; in 1950, 20.2; 1960, 38.2 and in 1964 we had passed the 50 million ton fishery production mark. Though this is far short of what we consider the ultimate ocean potential, there are many formerly rich fishing areas which today are in a serious state of depletion. No longer can we consider the ocean resources as inexhaustible.

Recognizing the great potential need for food from the sea and looking with concern the unrestricted exploitation of the fishery resources, I submitted a resolution to the United States Senate three years ago, calling attention to the need for world fishery conservation and the responsibility for the coastal and fishing nations to join in conference on the questions of conservation requirements. Had the United States State Department followed through on this unanimously adopted resolution, I feel certain that we would be in a far better position today to deal with the menacing fishing fleets of the Soviet Union which have so recently appeared off the Washington and Oregon coasts. In the absence of the earlier implementation of that proposed world fishery conference, I have asked the President to join with Secretary of State Rusk in an immediate diplomatic confrontation with the Russians that we may discuss a proper conservation regime for the adjacent fishery stocks.

Further, I am asking Secretary Rusk and his Department to speed the implementation of the 1958 Geneva Convention on Fishing which provides some special rights and interests to the coastal state including the enforcement of conservation of resources being fished in the high seas off its coasts by itself or others, or only by others. There are conditions whereby the coastal state can even enforce conservation measures on the fishermen of other nations on the high seas unilaterally. I do not know whether this Convention, which now enjoys twenty-two ratifications, can provide an answer to the conservation problems with which we are concerned, but I do know that it must be our dedicated responsibility to press every avenue that harvest shall be within the requirements of maximum sustainable yield.

As Chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee I have called for immediate hearings on Senator BARTLETT's 12-mile limit bill. These are now scheduled for May 18 and 19. It is my hope that the hearings on the 12-mile proposal will produce the kind of testimony necessary to enable a proper decision of just what is in our long-range national interest.

The United States fisheries have been in an area of despondency, and the future has appeared as dark and univiting. We have stumbled from adversity of crisis and there has been little economic surplus for renewal of harvest or processing tools. We have been visited by the curse of unfair competition in the market place, and our international dealings have been regularly marked by the sacrifice of the commercial fisherman and his industry on varying altars for what has been glibly referred to as the broad national interest.

I wish that I could say today that all of these storms are safely over the horizon, that smooth seas and fair winds were promising only good harvest. This is not so, and your need for courage and resourcefulness will be ever present.

But I can say today that the handful of us in the Congress and in Government who have long regarded the fruits of your harvest as of great value is growing, and when we speak of the broad national interest today there are many more in the number who would include fishermen and the fishing industry as a segment of the economy above that level of national or international sacrifice.

I would leave you with this final thought. There is no greater threat to that peace than the millions of fathers who go to bed hungry and awaken to the whimper of their children, weak with that same hunger and unable to cry. What greater challenge, what more satisfying reward than the harvest and production of food that the cause of peace may be better served.

#### GOP SHAPES PRUDENT POLICY ON VIETNAM

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am proud of the fact that Republicans in Congress have been acting responsibly in their comments and statements on the situation in Vietnam. Roscoe Drummond calls attention to this in his column which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer of May 31. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Drummond's column be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### GOP SHAPES PRUDENT POLICY ON VIETNAM (By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—In the wake of the Oregon Democratic primary's indorsement of President Johnson's course in Vietnam, Republican leaders in Congress are taking a new look at how they ought to handle the Vietnam issue in the coming elections.

They are becoming aware that, if they attack the President indiscriminately, they are more likely to hurt themselves. They can't afford to throw away their advantage of being more united behind the defense of Vietnam than the Democrats by heckling the President and thus helping to disunite the country.

The Republicans have two campaign issues affecting Vietnam on which they can rightly capitalize.

A good case can be made that the Government would be strengthened for whatever tests lie ahead by correcting the egregious imbalance the two parties in both the House and the Senate. The Johnson Administration needs an effective watchdog opposition in Congress and the Republicans need more seats to fill that need.

Secondly, if the country wants Congress to back President Johnson's course in Vietnam and to give him the support he needs to exert both patience and firmness, he is more likely to get it by increasing the Republican members than by giving any encouragement to the Democratic liberal dissidents.

The latest evidence is that the emergent Republican position on Vietnam is both prudent and constructive.

A good example is the speech which Rep. CHARLES E. GOODALL of New York, chairman of the GOP Committee on Planning and Research, prepared for delivery in the House. It was previewed without objection by other top Republicans. In tone and substance it is in keeping with everything Sen. EVERETT DIRKSEN has been saying.

GOODALL helps the Administration by delivering a warning which undoubtedly reflects the attitude of the President. It is that, if the South Vietnamese themselves withdraw from the conflict or if civil dis-



special breed. Like the man in the crow's nest surveying the horizon, these men are ever looking to the future, seeking battle with nature, new discoveries, new crops, and new markets.

While the space race gets the headlines and perhaps captures the imagination of some of those who in former years would look to the sea, there are still men of vision who see the oceans as a great frontier to be cultivated today to build a better tomorrow.

One of the most persuasive, most effective of these men is the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], Capitol Hill's leading advocate of making the United States the world's ranking seapower.

On April 25, 1966, Senator MAGNUSON once again demonstrated that his eyes were focused on the horizon of the future. In a speech at Aberdeen, Wash., where he conducted hearings on a bill authorizing construction of experimental plants to manufacture fish protein concentrate—FPC—the Senator made clear the prime importance of manufacturing FPC was to nourish the ever growing number of hungry people in the world.

He noted:

The real benefits of the fish protein concentrate program will come in its broad national context, in its needed contribution toward feeding the hungry of the world, and thus eliminating one of the prime causes of war. \* \* \* America is today the leader in the struggle toward world peace, and a prime foundation segment of that effort structure is our continuing aid programs to the underdeveloped nations of the world. A failure on our part to meet this assistance challenge could only produce additional breeding grounds for the infestation and eventual domination of these countries in the world plan for communist control.

Because of the importance of Senator MAGNUSON's address, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD as it was reported in a recent edition of the Fishermen's News.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREAT FPC FUTURE FORECAST BY SENATOR IN ABERDEEN SPEECH

The creation of a successful commercial fishery is not an easy task as those of you associated with that industry will readily attest. There are many necessary facets, but certainly at the top of the requirement list must certainly be adequate raw resource and commensurate market. Just as important are harvesting and processing techniques, and then the energy, ability and courage of individuals willing to enthusiastically pursue the often difficult path of the pioneer. And these men who will finance and operate the fine new plant now under construction in Aberdeen, and the fishermen who are building new vessels or converting old ones to participate in the sea harvest are pioneers no less so than Captain Robert Gray or Samuel Benn who are identified and honored by history for their contribution to the founding and development of this region.

The heritage of this entire area is founded on the spirit of courage and resourcefulness and rugged determination in carving communities out of what was once a forest wilderness. I would pay homage to these contemporary pioneers today, for from their comparatively small beginnings in this business of utilizing America's adjacent fishery

resources, I envision an industry of great consequence in the years ahead. For this new industry to grow to the kind of proportions we speak of, there is need for a great raw resource. What then, is available?

To me, there is no question of resource abundance. The presence of the huge fishing fleets of the Soviet Union, thousands of miles from home, serves as daily testimony of the rich wealth which abounds off the West Coast of the United States. The estimates are still uncertain, but with each revision, the new figure is greater than the last. Indeed, the last preliminary estimates as to the total harvestable fishery resource off the United States Coast by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries was a figure of 22 billion pounds. When we consider that the domestic U.S. fleets take about 4.5 billion pounds and our total fishery use, from what we catch and what we import, is about 12 billion pounds, it is quite obvious that we may rest assured that we have raw product for this new industry.

This does not mean, however, that we can stand idly by, or allow ourselves the luxury of reflection on these quantities of marine resources which we so often refer to as "ours." The truth of the matter is, that by present international standards of ocean practice they are not ours, but belong to that nation that can reduce them to harvest. Here on the Pacific Coast we have watched the progressive southward movement of two foreign nations—Japan and the Soviet Union—as they have extended their operations into the once virgin fishery stocks offshore, and today the latter nation is vigorously exploiting resources off both the Washington and the Oregon coast.

In a sense we have been engaged in a race for fish, and America has not done very well, having slipped from second to fifth place in the world production record. I have heard criticism of the fishermen and the processor for America's poor showing in this race, but the record will clearly show that the fishing industry has not had an even competitive chance in this contest. Agriculture has enjoyed elaborate aids here in the United States, it has been protected from foreign competition by a variety of quotas, tariffs and other controls, few of which have been available to those who harvest the sea.

#### NEW FRONTIERS OFF OUR SHORES

There are new fishery frontiers remaining for the American fishermen off our coasts, and one of the most promising of these is the Pacific hake resource, which will provide the initial and prime raw resource for the new Grays Harbor fish meal operation. The harvesting techniques—the midwater trawl in particular—as developed by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries is a prime factor in our present ability to proceed with this project. There are other unutilized offshore species, some perhaps in greater abundance than the Pacific hake, and I am confident that harvesting methods can be developed for these so that the supply to the shore processor may be more consistent and the fishing season may be extended. I am pressing in this session of the Congress for the inclusion of a \$100,000 item that the work of the Bureau's Seattle Exploratory Fishing and Gear Research Base may be continued and considerably enhanced.

The second factor for consideration in the development of a new fishing industry is the matter of market, for without someplace to sell the fish, the resource would continue as valueless. There is good market at present for fish meal, and this will be the prime production product of the new Grays Harbor plant. The use of fish meal in the diet of poultry and livestock has had a fantastic effect on the harvest of those species which are so used. Under the pressure of increased demand, world production of fish meals and solubles, mostly for poultry and animal feed-

ing, increased from about 590,000 metric tons in 1948 to 3,500,000 metric tons in 1964, and the market appears to be stable and growing. We have come a long way from the days when we thought of fish meal only as fertilizer, and we are literally one step away from direct human consumption. This final step has been a long time in coming and will constitute a major breakthrough in fishery processing and marketing history. I refer, of course, to Fish Protein Concentrate.

#### WHY FISH PROTEINS EXCEL

What are some of the properties of this revolutionary product that have made it such an exciting subject in world nutritional circles:

1. Fish proteins contain all the amino acids required by the human today in proportions well adjusted to keeping the body in vigorous health. In addition, there are plus factors, vitamins, calcium, trace minerals, polyunsaturated animal oils, etc.
2. The proteins of all fish are substantially the same. Thus a fully dehydrated and defatted product, made of a considerable variety of ocean run fish together, is as valuable nutritionally as that made from selected high-priced fish.

3. Fish proteins can be dehydrated cheaply and the proteins not damaged in the process if reasonable care is used.

4. Dehydrated fish proteins can be packaged economically so that they can be shipped and stored for long periods of time cheaply and in stable form.

This brings us then to the final ingredient for success of the creation of the new industry; the human factor. Though this is perhaps the most important of all, it is here that I have the least concern, for I have an unswerving faith in the ability of the American fishermen to go forth and compete with the best fishermen in the world, provided the competition is on reasonably equal terms. I have equal faith in the imagination and ingenuity of American industrial technology, and here again, we have consistently proven our superiority.

Certainly the proper development of this Fish Protein Concentrate program is of vital interest to the citizens of Grays Harbor, for the creation of new industry and the resultant economic benefits is not easy to come by. It is of great personal importance to me also, not only for the benefits which it can provide to the economy of this and other areas of the State of Washington, but because it represents some goals in sight on an effort which dates back a good many years to a time when the discussion of fish flour or Fish Protein Concentrate was quite foreign to the average citizen.

But the real benefits of the Fish Protein Concentrate program will come in its broad national context, in its needed contribution toward feeding the hungry of the world and thus alleviating one of the prime causes of war.

It is difficult for many of us in well fed America to realize that we live in a world filled with hunger. Scientists tell us that about 60% of the present world population is suffering from what they term animal protein malnutrition. History tells us that the inevitable companion of hunger is political unrest, the forerunner of war. One of history's oldest lessons is found in the fact that there must be a reasonable balance of food and advantage if peace is to be maintained. President Johnson clearly pointed this out last September when he noted that one-fourth of the people of the world cannot long maintain their ability to have everything they want against three-quarters suffering from want in every form.

America is today the leader in the struggle toward world peace, and a prime foundation segment of that effort structure is our continuing aid programs to the underdeveloped nations of the world. A failure on our part

June 4, 1966

orders force such withdrawal, "the United States may have no alternative but to withdraw."

But Goodell does not leave the Republicans simply in the position of just supporting the President. He urgently counsels the White House to quit pretending it can play no positive part in furthering the conditions needed for "free and meaningful elections in South Vietnam."

Goodell proposes these steps:

That a pre-election agreement be prompted among responsible representatives of all major Vietnamese groups to abide by the outcome of the balloting.

That supervision of the election be undertaken by an international commission of disinterested third-party states, not the U.S. or any Communist Power.

That as part of the election there be a direct vote on the war itself.

This is the kind of thoughtful advocacy which can put Republicans in the best possible position to go before the voters on the Vietnam issues this fall.

## NEED FOR RESEARCH ON NATION'S ESTUARIES

Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. President, on Sunday, May 1, 1966, a feature article appeared in the Outlook section of the Washington Post stressing the danger of pollution in our Nation's estuaries. The article, written by Mr. Eric Wentworth points out that "estuarine pollution" is far more difficult to study and control than pollution in individual rivers or lakes." Mr. Wentworth goes on to say that "there's growing awareness that estuaries are valuable biological resources and that they're being lost to us bit by bit."

The article states that my bill (S. 3240), calling on the Interior Department to make a 3-year, \$3 million comprehensive study of estuaries and their problem, is a concrete step that would "focus attention on estuaries as a special problem." The article stressed the importance of our Nation's estuaries as areas for recreation as well as important sources of food and a livelihood for many people. The article urges that we find a way of stopping the further pollution of these areas.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 1, 1966]

### DIRTY RIVERS ARE CLEAN COMPARED TO ESTUARIES

(By Eric Wentworth)

Pollute a river, and there's only one way for the stuff to go—downstream. But it's different, and much more complicated, in harbors, bays, and other estuaries where tides ebb and flow and fresh water meets salt water.

The sweep to the sea is delayed and the tides slosh polluted water back and forth and sometimes sideways like a miner panning for gold—and when dirty river water encounters salt water peculiar physical and chemical changes cause some pollutants to mix with clay particles and fall in little lumps to the bottom where they form noxious "sludge banks."

These complexities combined with the vast variety of filth spilling into, say, the Chesapeake Bay directly, and through numerous streams and rivers, show why so-called

"estuarine pollution" is far more difficult to study and control than pollution in individual rivers or lakes.

### WADING INTO THE PROBLEM

Lawmakers and policymakers have begun wading into this long-neglected problem with proposals to give the estuaries something approaching national attention.

"There's growing awareness that estuaries are valuable biological resources and that they're being lost to us bit by bit," says one Government planner.

By one reckoning, one-fourth of the American populace lives within 50 miles of the seacoast. They and countless others use the estuaries for swimming, sailing, fishing and other recreation. The estuaries are an important source of food and also provide a livelihood for many people.

In the face of these growing demands, the days are gone when people could blithely assume that anything dumped into an estuary from factory or shipboard would do no harm before being whisked out to sea by the tides, even if it took quite a while.

Estuaries have "taken severe punishment" from human use in the past, John S. Gottschalk, director of the Interior Department's Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, charged in a speech last fall. Secretary of Interior Stewart L. Udall told a Senate subcommittee recently that estuaries have been "sort of a garbage dump."

### THE IMPACT OF SEWAGE

The environmental Pollution Panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee dealt with the special problem of estuarine pollution in its report last November on "Restoring the Quality of Our Environment."

The Panel cited dramatic case histories, including the impact of sewage and industrial waste on New Jersey's Raritan Bay where swimmers, fishermen and clammers once disappeared.

"Its once clean waters which contained large numbers of harvestable shellfishes and many other species of invertebrates," the Panel concluded, "were transformed by the pressures of industrialization and the resulting population expansion into a septic, despoiled environment, murky with domestic and industrial wastes and \* \* \* peculiar, undesirable flora."

Another case: Long Island's Great South Bay and Moriches Bay, where pollution, first from nearby duck farms and more recently from human sewage, ruined a once-prosperous shellfish industry and has hampered recreational use—producing among other things "unpleasant gases" that discolored the paint on waterside houses.

Aside from such disastrous incidents, and the occasional, sudden "kills" of fish or fowl caused by one-shot dumping of poisonous matter, there are many more situations where estuarine pollution is a creeping, insidious and sometimes mysterious malignancy undermining the habitat.

Conservation-minded Government officials figure the pollution problem is serious in many areas where they lack the facts at this point to prove it.

"We know so little now about what makes estuaries tick," one says.

### FANTASTICALLY FERTILE

In their unspoiled state, estuaries and the salt marshes that often border them are fantastically fertile. The Sapelo marshes of Georgia, for example, are said to produce in a given area nearly seven times as much organic matter as a comparable area in the waters of the Continental Shelf, and six times as much as a same-sized area in the average wheat field.

Oysters, clams and crabs are among the permanent residents of estuaries. Such important commercial or sport fish as menhaden, bluefish, croaker and prawns spend their early life in these waters. Others, in-

cluding salmon, shad, herring and striped bass, pass through on their way to spawning grounds. And many offshore fish, such as the mackerel, which may not visit the estuaries, depend for food on creatures that do.

Then there are the birds, some hunted with guns and others with field glasses. Some are year-round residents; many are seasonal visitors.

Pollution, be it caused by pulp mills, chemical plants, municipal sewers or yacht toilets, isn't the only man-caused hazard. Conservationists frequently frown at channel-dredging, which can upset the underwater balance of nature in estuaries, and the dumping of dredged-up mud or other spoil on marshes.

Countless thousands of marsh, or "wetland," acres have been filled to provide dry land for factories, farms or housing developments. Other marshes have been drained to control mosquitoes, quarried for gravel or used for trash dumps. Dams built far upstream affect river flows and thus can harm estuary life by allowing salt water on occasion to intrude further inland.

### TYDINGS PROPOSAL

As one step toward protection, Sen. JOSEPH D. Tydings (D-Md.) recently introduced a bill calling on the Interior Department for a three-year, \$3 million "comprehensive study" of estuaries and their problems, with a report to include recommendations for a national follow-up program.

The Public Health Service has gotten involved in estuarine problems to some extent. As part of 10 major river basin studies, it has undertaken to identify pollution sources and recommend abatement methods. These studies, whose subjects include the Delaware River, and the Susquehanna River plus Chesapeake Bay, have become responsibilities of the new Water Pollution Control Administration scheduled to move to the Interior Department soon.

The Tydings study would be complementary, but broader. Some Government analysts, eyeing the intricacies of estuaries, believe the Senator's proposal would barely scratch the surface of needed research. They note that a thorough British study of the Thames Estuary alone took between six and seven years. Still, the Tydings approach would focus attention on estuaries as a special problem.

Rep. JOHN D. DINGELL (D-Mich.), taking another tack, has proposed establishing a "National System" of estuarine areas—to be designated by the Secretary of Interior—that are either relatively unspoiled or could be restored. The Government could acquire land or water in these areas and regulate their public use.

Rep. HERBERT TENZER (D-N.Y.), and more recently Sen. ROBERT F. KENNEDY (D-N.Y.), have proposed creating a Long Island National Wetlands Recreation Area to protect some 16,000 acres of marsh on Hempstead and Oyster Bays through Federal acquisition or management. This measure, if approved, could set a pattern for other areas.

These and other possible proposals are being studied by Administration policymakers who hope to send their own legislative entry to Capitol Hill later this year.

While substantial controls of pollution sources are either on the books or before Congress in the President's "Clean Rivers Restoration" bill, Government officials are concerned about research and planning needs and such related problems as control of harmful dredging and indiscriminate land use in estuary areas. As yet, they aren't ready to discuss specific legislation.

Meanwhile, several states, among them Massachusetts, New York, Rhode Island and California, have taken steps to protect their estuaries through planning financial and technical aid, zoning or controls on dredging.

June 1, 1966

Still, public apathy and the opposition of commercial interests promise the conservationists a long, tough battle.

"As a visitor here," Interior's Gottschalk remarked to the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission at Biloxi, Miss., in March, "I detect or suspect a regional lack of regard for the balanced picture of natural resource conservation, and a preoccupation with 'economic progress' in exploiting natural resources.

"At the same time," he added, "I note hopeful if belated stirrings of public recognition that unlimited exploration may lead to disaster, that critical estuarine habitats must be protected and preserved."

Such stirrings can be noted these days in Washington as well.

#### HELP FOR THE HOUSEWIFE IN BUYING MEAT

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, meat is a big part of any housewife's food budget. On average, we spend about 30 percent of our food dollar for meat and poultry.

Aid in getting a good buy, then, is important to all of us. It is available in most food stores in the form of the USDA—U.S. Department of Agriculture—grade mark.

The familiar shield-shaped grade mark appears on about 85 percent of the beef cuts sold in grocery stores. Shoppers who understand its meaning and are guided by it can be sure of getting the quality they want and pay for.

If you want the best, you can probably find a store that sells the top grade, U.S. Prime. Most cuts of this grade are very tender, juicy, and flavorful.

U.S. Choice is the most popular grade of beef with most consumers and more of it is sold than any other grade. You can depend on Choice roasts and steaks to be consistently tender and juicy and have a well-developed flavor.

Thrifty shoppers often favor U.S. Good or U.S. Standard beef, because it has less fat than the higher grades. Beef of these grades is not as juicy or flavorful as Choice or Prime, but is just as nutritious.

Shoppers can depend on these USDA guides to qualify in buying beef because beef is graded by impartial Government graders who are experts in judging the quality. Quality of beef is almost impossible to judge in the retail cut. Graders, therefore, look at the whole carcass or large wholesale cuts. Grade is determined on the basis of U.S. standards which detail the requirements for each quality grade. The factors which determine the quality grade are those which experience, and research, have shown to be related to eating quality.

Some 450 graders, employed by USDA's Consumer and Marketing Service, provide meat grading service throughout the country to those who request it. It is provided on a fee-for-service basis.

The Consumer and Marketing Service, which administers all USDA grading programs, makes sure that the grader in California is interpreting the nationally-uniform U.S. beef standards in the same fashion as is the grader in New York.

Thus consumers in all parts of this country can rely on the USDA grades for beef to mean the same thing no matter where they live or where they shop.

#### A NATURAL DISASTER WARNING SYSTEM

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the Commerce Department, through its Environmental Science Services Administration, has proposed a nationwide Natural Disaster Warning System. The system would encompass all types of natural disasters from tornadoes to blizzards. The proposal, I believe, is a sound one and should be implemented.

Of particular interest to me is the section dealing with the flow of severe weather data from the source of the report to the public. The proposal notes there is no single system for mass dissemination of the information—that in many cases alert procedures have been improvised.

In my own State of Kansas, the broadcasters have worked out a system, which I feel deserves commendation. The Kansas Association of Radio Broadcasters, working with what is now the Environmental Science Services Administration, developed an expanded weather information teletype circuit.

Stations subscribing to the circuit receive not only the regular weather information from Government forecasters and meteorological stations across the State, but information from two State law enforcement agencies as well.

When severe weather threatens or strikes, the subscribers can receive, in a matter of minutes, information from Kansas Highway Patrolmen or Kansas Turnpike Authority officers at or near the scene of the storm. This has enabled broadcast stations on the circuit to provide the public with continually updated and fresh information about a specific storm. They are alerting, without alarming. The viewers and listeners know where the storm is at a given moment without having to wait and see.

The system has proved invaluable throughout the year whether an ice storm, blizzard or severe thunderstorm was on the way.

It is important to note this system was the product of initiative and a feeling of public service on the part of the Kansas Association of Radio Broadcasters who took it upon themselves to better serve their public.

Unfortunately the service costs more money than the usual weather information teletype circuit, and some stations cannot, financially, budget the extra expense. They make their own arrangements, which, I might add, have met the need.

Nevertheless, I am sure broadcasters across the country would welcome an improved system of natural disaster warning—a coordinated effort to permit them to better provide their listeners and viewers with the necessary data in time of emergency. Obviously not every group of broadcasters can, within itself, make the type of arrangement successfully implemented by Kansas broadcasters.

Obviously not every area or regional group of broadcasters can establish the same type of arrangement which is present in Kansas. For that reason I feel the proposed NADWARN system is of vital importance to the welfare of the people.

Mr. President, I urge all of my colleagues to study the proposal and support it.

#### RETIRED HURT BY INFLATION

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the value of the American dollar, both here and abroad, has always been a matter of prime concern.

In this connection, the rising cost of living could soon give serious problems to all those elderly Americans who depend almost entirely on social security benefit checks.

The dollar saved one year ago is now worth only about 97¢.

This statistic, plus other observations worthy of thought, are presented in a recent column by Sylvia Porter.

Noting that the brunt of inflation is borne by those living on fixed or slow rising pensions, Miss Porter points out the need to strive for savings and investments with which to supplement pension benefits.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Evening Star, May 24, 1966]

YOUR MONEY'S WORTH—RETIRED HURT BY INFLATION

(By Sylvia Porter)

The elderly American couple who retired in 1950 and qualified for the then \$120 maximum monthly benefit is now receiving \$168.60—reflecting the increases in benefit levels over the years. But because of the relentless climb in living costs in these 16 years, this couple's "real" income has been raised, not \$48.60, but only \$6.67 a month. In actual comparative buying power today the \$168.60 benefit check shrinks to \$126.67.

The very elderly couple who retired as far back as 1940 and drew that year's top \$68.40 in monthly social security benefits is now receiving \$152.50—or more than double the benefit a quarter-century ago. But because of rising living costs, this couple's benefit check will actually buy \$1.32 less than in 1940.

Before social security benefits were raised 7 percent across the board last year, the maximum being received by retired couples was the equivalent of just 3 cents more in buying power than the maximum received in 1950.

#### NEW STATISTICS

These statistics, compiled and to be released soon, by the Diversified Investment Fund, Inc., in Elizabeth, N.J., illustrate the position of those who depend primarily on social security benefits and underline the importance of savings and investments to supplement retirement income. In fact, the elderly who depend entirely on social security benefit checks are just barely keeping up with the rising cost of living. For them there is no financial leeway for any rise in living standards or any way to share in the Nation's prosperity.

Since 1950 per capita personal income has nearly doubled to today's \$2,872—far outpacing the 34 percent cost of living rise. Even assuming a living cost rise in the 2½–3 percent range this year, the pay of the vast majority of workers will rise enough to keep them ahead.

In contrast, by the end of 1966 well over half of 1965's Social Security benefit increase will have been swallowed by inflation. The dollar put away at the end of last year already has dwindled in value to less than



and redistricting would create still further problems.

One possible way out of this dilemma has been suggested by Representative DONALD RUMSFELD (R., Illinois). His proposal calls for alternating two- and four-year terms for each member. Over a twelve-year period a member would run four times, as compared with the present six elections: twice during presidential years, and twice in non-presidential years. This would seem to mitigate a division of the House into two classes, one overly responsive and the other unresponsive.

Such a proposal seems preferable to still a fourth variation: three-year terms for House members with one-third of the members up for re-election every year. Yet, both run the risk of further confusing a relatively uninformed, if responsible, electorate.

What are the chances that any of these variations will end up a constitutional amendment? In passing, let us note that constitutional amendments are difficult to create. More than twenty thousand have been proposed in the history of the country and only twenty-four have become the law of the land. The founding fathers provided for change but they did not intend for change to come about easily. Hence the requirement that constitutional amendments receive two-thirds of the votes of both Houses, followed by ratification of three-fourths of the state legislatures.

For the current proposals to tamper with the two-year terms for House members, the probabilities of adoption are becoming increasingly slim. Hearings held before the House Committee on Judiciary in February, 1966, have, if anything, dampened some of the early enthusiasm for either the President's or Representative CHERF's proposal. A January poll by the *Congressional Quarterly* revealed a stiffening opposition. Of those members who replied, the vote was 105 to 90 in favor in the House and 19 to 20 opposed in the Senate.

Among key Democrats who oppose four-year terms are EMANUEL CELLER of New York, chairman of the House Committee on Judiciary; FRANK THOMPSON of New Jersey, an influential House liberal; and, predictably, a number of Southern conservatives, including HOWARD W. SMITH of Virginia. The two most influential House Republicans, minority leader GERALD FORD of Michigan and Republican Conference chairman MELVIN LAIRD of Wisconsin, have both issued statements warning of the inherent dangers in the four-year term proposals.

Most of what support remains for four-year terms comes from the younger members of the House, particularly those associated with the Democratic Study Group (of which FRANK THOMPSON is chairman), an informal grouping of some 175 Northern and Western Democratic moderates and liberals.

Behind the growing opposition are practical considerations as well as the constitutional arguments. A major stumbling block, heretofore, has been opposition from United States Senators. Without built-in restrictions against running for other statewide offices, a four-year term would be virtual invitation for sitting House members to take on incumbent Senators or governors up for re-election in the off years. Presently a House member almost always is forced to give up his own seat in order to campaign against a Senator or governor. These public officials would prefer to keep it that way. A similar argument has been used against three-year House terms; this arrangement would allow state legislators with two- or four-year terms a free crack at incumbent House members.

The President's proposal has done away with most Senate opposition on these grounds by including a section which prohibits members of Congress from running for the other house unless the member resigns thirty days prior to such an election.

The Chelf resolution goes even further. It would prohibit a House member from seeking nomination or election to any office, other than a vacancy, unless he resigns in advance.

A final argument from the standpoint of practical politics is that four-year terms may lead to greater, not less, turnover among House members. There is virtual unanimity among successful congressmen that elections are really won in the odd years. Non-election year activities provide them with opportunities to make non-political speeches and emphasize their role as spokesman for all their district's interests. Incumbent congressmen have many advantages, including franking (free mailing) privileges, the assistance of a trained staff of up to ten members, and multiple chances to build good will and develop favorable publicity. So great is this advantage that, over the years, more than seven out of eight incumbents who run for reelection are victorious.

At first glance, four-year terms would seem to improve an incumbent's chances of being re-elected. He would, after all, have three non-election years to solidify his position. But this view may be misleading. If a member were not up for re-election every two years, the pressures on him to return to his district would be lessened. Polls reveal that, even now, as few as one-third of the electorate can name their congressman. Elections every two years provide a congressman with an opportunity to get his name before the public.

The existence of off-year elections are particularly valuable, since they allow congressmen to establish their independence from the national ticket. This independence is especially important in areas where the national party or its presidential candidate is not popular. Thus, a number of Southern liberal Democrats were able to withstand the Goldwater tide in their states because they had developed name-familiarity and independence from the national ticket. Similarly, a number of Northeastern liberal Republicans, most notably John Lindsay, were able successfully to divorce their 1964 campaigns from a losing national cause.

Four-year terms would probably lure additional candidates from private and public life into competition for House seats. District-wide races would almost inevitably be lower in cost than state-wide Senate campaigns. Young lawyers, labor leaders, businessmen, and other professionals might find running for the House almost as attractive as a Senate seat. Present incumbents will undoubtedly think twice before they vote for an amendment which poses the threat of increased competition and the danger of potentially greater turnover among House members.

Congressmen are overworked. Given their high responsibilities, heavy expenses, and the burden of frequent trips to and from their districts, annual salaries of \$30,000 make congressmen, if anything, underpaid. Many must start fund-raising, if not campaigning, almost as soon as the last election is over.

Yet, as the *Washington Post* recently commented in an unusually sympathetic editorial, "no one compels these men to run for Congress. Presumably they seek election to Congress because they like it, because they want the salary or because they see opportunity to render a national service, and we surmise that they will continue to do so regardless of how long the term is."

The Constitution requires that all members of the House of Representatives be elected every two years. Every four years they must run with the President of the United States, thus providing an opportunity for a strong presidential candidate to bring members along with him who will be sympathetic to his programs. Every four years, at

midterm elections, House members have their own contests. For the most part, these are relatively insulated from the forces which shape the outcomes of national presidential elections. From time to time they provide a mechanism for endorsing or rejecting administration policies.

It is a relatively simple and uncomplicated election system which has withstood the test of time. Occasionally the House responds slowly, or not at all, to the demands placed upon it by the President and the executive branch. On other occasions, its members may overreact to crisis. But the House continues to come closer to reflecting the will of the diverse local interests of our country than any branch of our national government.

On the whole, the House of Representatives has proven its worth as a viable and responsive legislative assembly. Two-year terms of office have been basic to the maintenance of this responsiveness to the will of the people.

## POLITICAL UNREST IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, in a recent column carried in the *Washington Post* and other newspapers, Rowland Evans and Robert Novak put their finger on what I, too, have come to consider the underlying reasons for the political unrest in South Vietnam at present. As Evans and Novak put it, the turmoil resulted not from machinations of the other side, but from the "mad rush by Vietnamese politicians to positions themselves for free elections." And all evidence indicates this maneuvering began as long ago as last January.

I know, Mr. President, that the impression I gained in Vietnam scarcely a month ago was largely the same. Indeed, I learned, our military efforts there were bearing such promise for future success that, for the first time, the local politicians and various pressure groups, as we could call them, were seeing the advantages to be had from control of the Government—or at least a share in that control. They all wanted a piece of the political pie, once it looked like it was worth having. A year ago, Mr. President, it didn't look that way. Now it does. That is a hopeful sign. I ask unanimous consent that the column by Evans and Novak be printed in the *RECORD*.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

### POLITICS, SAIGON-STYLE

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

The turmoil that brought South Vietnam to the brink of civil war and endangered the war against the Communists resulted, ironically, from a mad rush by Vietnamese politicians to position themselves for free elections.

Indeed, secret information available to U.S. officials shows that the origin of the turmoil can be traced with precision to Jan. 15, 1966, when Prime Minister Nguyen Cao Ky first began to talk seriously about a constitutional assembly and eventual elections.

Thus, the root cause of the growing chaos in South Vietnam is not—as the U.S. peace bloc would have it—rising neutralism and a desire to make peace with the Communists. What is happening today can be traced back to Air Marshal Ky's Jan. 15 statement. It is a story worth telling.

representatives. A member of the House represented but 30,000 inhabitants. Only 144 bills were introduced in the First Congress, 108 of which became laws.

Today, the population of the United States numbers more than 190,000,000 people. Almost two-thirds of the people live in urban areas. Social mobility, ease of travel, television, and newspapers have brought more and more people into communication and contact with one another. As the federal Government has grown and the role of government in the economy has increased, the demands on Congress have multiplied. Each House member now represents, on the average, 430,000 constituents. The workload of Congress has increased in volume and complexity; over 14,000 bills were introduced in the first session of the 89th Congress alone, and of these, 349 became public laws. Congressional sessions increasingly run for ten months or more of the calendar year.

In his first two or three terms, a House member's effectiveness as a legislator is reduced by his need to build a firm base of district support. As he gains in experience, of course, his ability to check upon and ameliorate the impersonal impact of the federal bureaucracy on his constituents is increased. As he begins to master the skills of serving his campaign and his constituency, a congressman can afford to devote more and more of his time to committee work and influencing the outcome of legislation.

He must still face the hazards of mounting campaign costs. Federal and state expenditure ceilings are ineffective and totally unrealistic. While campaign costs vary considerably from "safe" to competitive districts and from rural to urban districts, expenditures of \$50,000 to \$60,000 per campaign are not uncommon. Attempts to unseat incumbents can send these costs much higher. For example, a freshman Democrat from New York filed campaign expenditures of almost \$200,000 in a successful bid to defeat a Republican incumbent in 1964.

As another freshman Democratic member argued: "Four-year terms would prevent congressional offices from being 80 per cent campaign headquarters and only 20 per cent offices for legislative activities. As it is now, I am constantly involved in fund-raising."

The most direct approach to these problems, however, would be sensible revision of laws governing campaign expenditures and contributions.

Third, it is argued, four-year terms would probably attract more and better-qualified candidates for public office. By reducing the frequency of elections and the costs of continual campaigning, presumably more people would consider running for public office. The caliber of congressmen, already quite high, would no doubt be improved.

Sound as this argument may be, from a political standpoint it may be self-defeating. For this argument, unlike the others, can cut two ways in terms of mobilizing support for this constitutional amendment.

A fourth and crucial argument, used by many advocates of four-year terms for House members, is that it would enhance the influence of the President by centralizing party organization and making members more responsive to presidential programs. Members running with or against the President would be forced to campaign on national issues. "Coattail effects," or the tendency for congressional candidates of the same party to benefit from the size of the vote for strong presidential candidates, would be magnified.

President Johnson did not make use of this argument in his presidential message. However, Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach, in testimony before the House Judiciary Committee, did emphasize the impact of concurrent terms on executive-legislative party unity. Under this proposed amendment the President and Congress would be

more likely "to be able to carry out a program without unreasonable deadlocks."

The rationale for closer harmony between the President and Congress is given its more positive statement in Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK's book, *Congress: The Sapless Branch*. If a House member, CLARK argues,

... comes from a competitive district, he will be more of a statesman and less of an errand boy if he runs always at the same time and on the same ticket as the presidential candidate of his party. The strengthening of the national interest in terms of the effective dialogue on issues which such a procedural change would bring about is substantial. The strengthening of the national parties is even more so. The strengthening of the hand of the President, who alone speaks for all Americans, is the most substantial of all.

There rests the case, a strong one, for longer terms for House members. The first three arguments are especially appealing. A much stronger case, however, can be made for maintaining the present system of two-year terms.

The argument turns on commitment to the principle of coordinate branches of government. The practice of "separate institutions sharing power" is insured by multiple checks and balances built into our Constitution. Variation in the lengths of terms among our political leaders is one of the most fundamental safeguards against any single leader or institution dominating all the others to the detriment of democratic freedoms.

In our government, the House, Senate, and President frequently represent quite different political interests. These different interests deserve a hearing and need to be reconciled if public policy is to reflect the will of substantial majorities. Members of the House act as spokesmen for local, sometimes even parochial, interests. At the same time, they are called upon to legislate in the national interest.

Which interest should House members represent? Edmund Burke, in his "Speech to the Electors of Bristol" in 1774, presented what has become the classic argument in favor of representation of the national interest over local concerns. As Burke said: "Parliament is not a congress of ambassadors from different and hostile interests; which interests each must maintain, as an agent and advocate, against other agents and advocates; but Parliament is a deliberative assembly of one nation, with one interest, that of the whole; where, not local purposes, not local prejudices ought to guide, but the general good, resulting from the general reason of the whole."

What is sometimes overlooked is that hostility among the electors of Bristol to Burke's national views later forced him to withdraw as a candidate from this constituency.

In our country, a Representative must remain sensitive to the wishes of his constituents. He recognizes that they can turn him out if he does not vote in their best interests. If a legislator decides, as he not infrequently does, that national interests outweigh local considerations, then he does so at some risk.

It is this sensitivity to the will of the people which two-year terms of office help to preserve. This continuing tension between local and national interests is a strength, not a weakness, of the representative process. Many factors in our political system are at work to reinforce the impact of national interests; two-year terms assure that local needs will not be overlooked in an era increasingly characterized by expanding federal powers.

Furthermore, the elections of House members that occur between presidential elections perform several basic functions which add to the stability of our political system and strengthen our two-party system. Off-year elections provide an opportunity for a

review of presidential policies. The results can either extend the presidential mandate, as the election results of 1934 and 1962 were largely interpreted, or dampen it, as in the elections of 1918, 1946, 1954, and 1958. The election of 1966 may well turn on the success or failure of President Johnson's policies in Vietnam.

Midterm elections also provide the "out" party an opportunity to increase its strength in Congress. Since 1900, the party which does not control the White House has averaged a net gain of thirty-eight seats in off-year elections. In only one midterm election, 1934, was the party in power able to make a net gain of House seats. When the same party controls the White House for eight, twelve, or a longer period of years, midterm contests may become crucial for preserving a minority that can successfully criticize and provide alternatives to the majority.

A third and related point is that two-year terms provide a fundamental check on the powers of the Presidency. As the federal government has grown, the power of the President has increased. Four-year terms running concurrently with the President would weaken Congress at the same time that it would enhance the powers of the President. Some Democratic congressmen clearly owe their seats to the length of the President's "coattails" in the election of 1964. Yet few of these congressmen would welcome the idea of becoming more dependent upon presidential favor and national party, as distinct from congressional campaign committee, contributions.

Supporters of four-year terms may argue that these would give Representatives greater independence from interest-group and constituency pressures. But they can hardly argue that it would make them less susceptible to White House pressure at the same time that they say that it would lead to greater executive-legislative party solidarity. Four-year terms would remove one of the most effective shields now used by congressmen to withstand pressure. Almost every congressman has, at one time or another, found it convenient to take refuge from executive "arm-twisting" by the simple but almost irrefutable argument: "My people back home are opposed to this measure, and I am up for re-election next year."

Thus, it is for the very reasons that Burns, Senator CLARK, and others support four-year terms running concurrently with the President, that this constitutional amendment should be opposed. Such a change would drastically alter the separation of powers and checks and balances upon which our governmental system is based. Congress needs to maintain its independence from the Presidency. Re-election every two years furthers this independence, helps to maintain a viable minority party, and thus promotes the balance of power within the Government.

The staggered-term proposal advocated by Congressman CHIEF would counter this danger, but impose further problems of its own. Each state delegation would be divided by lot into two classes as equal as possible. One-half of the members would run with the President and the other half would run in midterm elections. Such a proposal runs the risk of splitting the House of Representatives into two classes of congressmen: those disposed to support the President, and those members elected in the off year who would likely oppose presidential programs. This might well lead to greater "deadlock" and prevent the occasional extraordinary Congress, such as the 89th, where legislation comes of age and productivity is exceptionally high.

In short, four-year terms concurrent with the President would promote a Congress overly responsive to the President. Staggered terms, on the other hand, would create a class of half the members who quite likely would be unresponsive. Reapportionment

Less than a month after Ky's statement pointed the way toward genuine political and governmental changes within South Vietnam, the militant Buddhists headed by mystical, enigmatic Thich Tri Quang began secretly to plan for future elections.

Tri Quang's plan was somewhat similar to the political organizing of, say, a democratic big-city boss in preparation for a presidential election in the U.S.A. If an election were really going to be held in South-Vietnam, the agile, ambitious Tri Quang wanted his agents to be ready for it.

This meant many things had to be done. It was necessary, for example, to set up an organization—nothing so precise as the political organization in the precincts of an American city, but a political organization in rudimentary form. Militant Buddhists who follow Tri Quang had to be assigned specific political chores, taught how to promote candidates and conduct a campaign.

A blueprint complete to the last detail, drawn up in January has been studied by U.S. officials and conclusively demonstrates that Tri Quang's political agitation predated President Johnson's celebrated meeting with Ky at Honolulu Feb. 6.

This should partially lay to rest the myth that President Johnson is personally responsible for the political crisis because he put his arm around Ky at Honolulu.

But if Tri Quang was organizing a disciplined core of student-politicians as long ago as January, Ky's conduct after the Honolulu conference unquestionably added fuel to the political agitation.

The Johnson Administration had hoped that when Ky returned to Saigon after Honolulu, and later, pushed by the Buddhists, announced a specific date for the election of a constitutional assembly, he would close his eyes to pressure tactics by the Buddhist militants in central Vietnam, centered in Danang and Hue.

The hope was that General Ky would concentrate on the war, on reconstruction and most important on talking up the election—and let the militant Buddhists stir up a little trouble without retaliation.

Instead, buoyed by his meeting with the President and alarmed at Buddhist agitation in the northern First Corps area, Ky fired Buddhist-backed Gen. Thi, First Corps commander. Ever since, the political battle has steadily escalated.

The discovery of electioneering plans drawn up in January illustrates one hard fact: feuding political forces in South Vietnam are preparing in dead seriousness for an election this September. The activities of Tri Quang should be judged more in that light than as an effort either to bring down the Ky government or undermine the U.S. military effort.

The political zeal, despite its hazards, poses opportunities for the long-term U.S. interest. Each of the hostile, feuding factions in South Vietnam—the Buddhists, split into many groupings, the Catholics, the religious sects, the military—are worried about getting left at the gate when the election is held. They all want a piece of the political pie that will result from that election.

It was an understanding of this fact that led President Johnson to murmur to Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, just before Lodge returned to Saigon:

"I've been in public life for 30 years and I've learned that the proper role of politics is to include and not to exclude."

The basic reason for all the agitation in South Vietnam is that every one wants to be included.

## NEW HAVEN'S VOICE IN HARTFORD STILL ROARING AFTER 50 YEARS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the above headline appeared in the May 28 issue of the Hartford Courant, Hartford, Conn. The article then goes on to tell about an unusual man. For 50 years Abe White has given information to thousands upon thousands of travelers who came to the big central information desk at the Union Station in Hartford. Abe knew them all—the high and the mighty and the hesitant and the confused. During all this time, his friendliness and good humor was a joy to all. He has a host of friends. Personally, it was always a pleasure to stop and chat with an old friend during the many times I have had occasion to use Union Station. His commonsense and wisdom makes him a real down-to-earth philosopher. I join his many friends in wishing him many more years of happiness and service to his fellowmen.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Hartford Courant be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### NEW HAVEN'S VOICE IN HARTFORD STILL ROARING AFTER 50 YEARS

(By Malcolm L. Johnson)

About 30 years ago or more—Abe White can't recall the year exactly—The Courant sent a photographer down to Union Station to take a picture of the great Irish tenor John McCormack when he rolled into town.

"They wanted to black me out of the picture," says Abe White, then, as now, at the information desk at the station.

McCormack interceded (and White does a nice brogue to mimic him): "If you don't take his picture, you don't take mine."

Friday The Courant sent a photographer to the station to get a picture of a man who's been 50 years in railroading. And White didn't have any trouble getting in the picture as Trainmaster Joseph F. Daly wrote on the information board:

"50 Years!!! Still on Time!!!" in tribute to White's punctuality.

During a half century in the business of portering mail and "grabbing numbers" in the baggage room, working in the branch engine house and—for 42 of the 50 years—bawling out the time of arrival and departure of engines, he has always—unlike the trains—always been on time.

White, now a youthful, still sentorian 64, recalls his first shout from the information desk 42 years ago.

There was no public address system, at the desk, then at the far north end of the station.

#### LET IT ROAR

"That first train came in and I let out a shout . . . there were 500 or 600 in the waiting room in them days . . . I just opened my mouth and let it roar out; and the boss said 'You don't have to get mad at the train.'"

John McCormack, who stood up for White's right to be in a photograph long before the New Haven Railroad decided to give him a diamond pin and a gold pass card for 50 years in railroading, is the man White thinks of first when he turns his mind back

to the people he's seen passing through the station and talked to.

But as he gets talking he also recalls Bebe Daniels and Ben Lyons coming into town to play at the old Parsons, Rudy Vallee, Henry Agard Wallace, Al Smith and Harry S. Truman—"It was his second trip through and as he came down the steps, two FBI men shoved like they were the president."

#### RECALLS BETTER DAYS

Abe White has seen a lot of years of railroading from the information desk and recalls the days when the New Haven line thrived.

"For a Yale-Harvard Game," he says, "we'd have 24 sections stringing back behind Flow-er Street."

Now there are only 25. But, White says, 90 to 95 per cent of them are on time.

Only when the New Haven's management "let the equipment go to hell" were there breakdowns and delays of two or three hours that gave the local line its now undeserved reputation for tardiness.

Forty-two years at an information desk have meant that Abe White has had to take a lot of wisecracks. "What time does the 3:21 get in?" is his unfavorite. He has as he says, also had to "take a lot of people by the hand."

Some people, he doesn't mind helping, he says. "My specialty has been trying to help any individual who is handicapped or can't speak English."

#### HANGOUT

And in the old days, all kinds of people used to stop by at the Information Desk to talk.

Lou Gehrig used to hang around the desk when he played with the Hartford Chiefs, Morgan B. Brainerd, then president of the Aetna Life Insurance Co., used to say: "When I want to meet my friends I come down to the information desk," according to White.

When he thinks back on it all, White says: "The information Desk was actually the crossroads of the country."

## I. W. ABEL AND THE UNITED STEELWORKERS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of the Senate an article in the Business Week of May 28 concerning the splendid leadership of Mr. I. W. Abel, president of the United Steelworkers. I think it is very significant that this respected business publication would carry such a laudatory article on this exceptional labor leader, Mr. Abel.

I am also pleased with this fine article because a key member of Mr. Abel's leadership team in the Steelworkers is Mr. Walter Burke, a distinguished leader of the labor movement in Wisconsin who was for many years director of District No. 32 of the Steelworkers at Milwaukee. Walter Burke was elected secretary-treasurer of the Steelworkers Union at the same time, Mr. Abel was elected president.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### ABEL FINDS A BROADER ROLE FOR THE USW—HE WORKS WITH REUTHER, AND SERVES AS A UNIFYING FACTOR IN AFL-CIO

The new attitudes that I. W. Abel brought to the leadership of the United Steelworkers



June 1, 1966

only a year ago are having far-reaching effects on the labor movement.

Abel's friendship with Walter Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers, and the closer ties between the two largest industrial unions have altered the power structure of AFL-CIO. With the solid backing of the 1.1-million-member Steelworkers, "Walter is relatively stronger within AFL-CIO than he has been for a long time," says a federation official.

Many unionists think Abel's influence extends even beyond the industrial unions. Abel has been cementing relations with other segments of labor, even while his appearances at UAW and United Packinghouse Workers conventions were being hailed as signs of a new solidarity among AFL-CIO's industrial unions.

#### CATALYST

An Israeli bond drive dinner honoring Abel in Pittsburgh last month drew 16 international officers of other unions; many building trades officials were there, though their crafts have long been cool to the Steelworkers. Said a USW official, looking over a large gathering: "Abel is the catalytic agent that can bring unity to the labor movement across the nation."

Abel, a pleasant, rumbling former mill-hand, has an aura of "fundamental trade unionism" that appeals to the old-line AFL. Yet his concept of labor's role as "the squeaky wheel in our Cadillac society" is close to Reuther's brand of social unionism.

Abel isn't the only one stirring new interest in USW. He is just one of the triumvirate that runs the union; Vice-President Joseph P. Molony and Secretary-Treasurer Walter J. Burke also spread the union's influence, though less visibly and at lower levels than Abel.

These three are remaking USW into the socially and politically active union that it was under Philip Murray. Within the Steelworkers, worry over the Abel team's policies and bargaining effectiveness still lingers, but in wider labor circles there is little doubt of the impact.

#### MORE PARTICIPATION

An AFL-CIO spokesman says the best way to describe the changed role of the union in federation activities is that "the United Steelworkers is now an active participant, not just a dues-paying member of AFL-CIO."

The change springs as much from a difference in attitudes and personality between Abel and his predecessor, David J. McDonald, as from any difference in basic union philosophy. Abel is a hard-working team player, a committee man, who believes strongly in identifying USW's interests with those of the whole labor movement and society.

McDonald pursued a more independent course; he tried to create a separate identity for his union. Working in bursts of energy, making his main effort in bargaining, he often neglected the old Murray and CIO tradition of broad political and social involvement.

"In terms of politics," says a USW staff man, "Abe is more liberal than Dave. In terms of organization, he's more effective—not because he's an organizational genius, but because he works harder."

#### AND MORE COMMITMENT

It wasn't that McDonald lacked belief in AFL-CIO (he helped set up the 1955 merger), or in social causes such as civil rights (his 1962 steel contract contained significant seniority improvements for minorities). But many unionists felt McDonald didn't push hard enough in these and other areas. "Dave's approach to civil rights," says a USW man, "was something between great enthusiasm and complete neglect."

McDonald's inability to get along with Reuther lessened his interest in joint projects sponsored by the federation's Industrial Union Dept., of which Reuther is head. And in later years, McDonald seemed to lose much of his interest in AFL-CIO affairs. "McDonald would spend about an hour and a half in executive council meetings, and then disappear," says a federation spokesman. "Abel is there on time, stays throughout, and takes part."

#### CLOSE TIES

Abel's closeness to Reuther, says an IUD official, has led to "more participation in IUD by more people, and by more USW locals." Under Abel, the union has thrown in with other IUD unions for joint bargaining and organizing efforts, more than it did in McDonald's day.

Abel shares Reuther's economic and political beliefs so closely that in government circles he is already being treated as Reuther's alter ego. Recently, with Reuther busy with the Auto Workers convention, Abel was named—along with federation President George Meany—to a subcommittee to draft a position paper on wage guideposts for President Johnson's Labor-Management Advisory Committee.

Not long ago, Reuther boasted: "When USW and UAW are marching arm in arm, there is no power in America that can halt the American labor movement." Whether the alliance will gallop as fast as Reuther's rhetoric remains to be seen. But officials of both unions point to practical effects of the improved relationship. USW is helping the Auto Workers to organize a new General Motors plant at Lordstown, Ohio. A new feeling of good faith is going into the solution of jurisdictional squabbles.

Pat Greathouse, Auto Workers vice-president, points out that there was cooperation before Abel came to power. But he adds that Abel is "much more available on matters of day-to-day operations—the problem with McDonald was that he wasn't there."

A Steelworkers staff man says there are indications that Abel's interest in avoiding jurisdictional fights with building trades unions is having some effect. Abel, he says, gives "personal testimony" to understandings reached at staff level. "McDonald," he adds, "couldn't be bothered."

#### RANK-AND-FILE

Whether the new ideas being pushed by Abel, Molony, and Burke are seeping down to the rank-and-file is questionable. To the locals, what Abel says to Reuther at an IUD meeting in Washington is pretty remote; local and plant matters are more important.

There is some rank-and-file restiveness over the "washing out" of many local grievances at the end of the contract negotiations that Abel led last year. In some steel companies, the backlog of unsettled grievances has been growing, although the trend is not industry-wide. In 1968, Abel will be under pressure, but no over-all membership revolt is in sight.

There is also no sign of a power struggle being initiated by the union's middle management—where the pro-Abel movement began in 1964. Abel is giving his 30 district directors more say, and is keeping them on their toes. And his entrenched position in the federation leadership helps protect him from the sort of attack that he successfully launched to unseat McDonald.

#### BARGAINING

Still to come, though, is a union-wide debate on bargaining procedures. Abel has opened the door to increased local participation in negotiations; now he must find a way to make this more meaningful to the locals, without drowning talks in a deluge of local issues.

A top-level committee headed by Molony may soon unveil recommendations for changes in bargaining; hints dropped by Abel suggest the changes may be in unexpected areas. The committee discussed the old policy of bargaining jointly with a group of major companies, but insiders doubt there will be substantial changes here, since separate talks at individual companies might raise more problems than they solve.

It is known that the committee is considering disbanding the 163-member wage-policy committee, which ratifies steel contracts. Abel recently told a press conference that he prefers the ratification method used in aluminum contracts, where a majority of locals must vote approval, and where locals are free to strike on their own issues.

This would be a radical departure, and the industry is worried lest it lead to more strikes. Already the industry and some union officials are worried over a possible return to crisis bargaining in 1968, with eventual government intervention. Says a union man: "When I consider the level of this so-called debate on bargaining in the union, I shudder. And this inability of our union officers to see the danger of government intervention is frightening."

#### QUEST FOR EFFICIENCY

It's a long time to 1968, and meanwhile the Abel team can point to internal changes that they say make for a more efficient union.

Most of these moves sought to shore up an organizational structure unresponsive to central direction, and thus to Abel's stronger social and political efforts. For example, a civil rights committee was reorganized after 15 years, and for the first time was put under an international officer, Molony. A Negro unionist, Alex Fuller, was brought in as director, and the committee is pressing locals, particularly in the Birmingham area, to give up discriminatory seniority agreements—now under fire from the National Assn. for the Advancement of Colored People, which threatens demonstrations this summer.

In the political area, Abel is urging officers at all levels to take a personal interest in labor legislation; he himself went to Washington a few months ago and "hit the Senate lobby."

#### EDUCATION

Abel has also set up a broad educational program for staff and district and international officers, very similar to a Reuther-UAW program.

The international's fiscal controls over a sprawling, unwieldy union are being tightened by Abel. Reorganization of the union's legal department, under a new general counsel, will save \$250,000 a year. The union's monthly paper, Steel Labor, will save \$80,000 a year by switching to offset printing. Economies in Abel's own office include cutting the number of New York Times subscriptions from five to one.

Abel runs executive board meetings with a touch of formality—only board members are admitted. In McDonald's day, department heads, technicians, and "a whole congregation of people" might be packed in the meeting room. Where McDonald used to travel "in an entourage of bodyguards and funkies," with Cadillacs awaiting him at airports, Abel as often as not travels alone.

#### OTHER GOALS

The Abel team hasn't done everything it wanted to.

In many ways, the past year has been one of "evaluation and review." Some changes have been put off until after the convention in September when a reading can be gotten on rank-and-file reaction to the changes already made.

Massachusetts congressional delegation and concerned citizens have contested a Defense Department decision to close the Springfield Armory.

When this decision was originally made in November 1964, the Department of Defense indicated that the Springfield Armory operation was uneconomical and must be discontinued. Immediately, members of the Springfield community organized the Springfield Technical Committee to investigate the facts. This committee of armory employees knew from personal experience that the armory operated efficiently. The objective of this committee, therefore, was to provide the concrete analysis and solid argument to prove this fact. The Springfield Technical Committee, led by Mr. Henry T. Downey, a local certified public accountant, compiled and analyzed data obtained from Department of Defense sources, and questioned the Defense Department's assumptions on which the decision to close the armory had been based. The Massachusetts congressional delegation and the Springfield Technical Committee met personally with Secretary McNamara on February 27, 1965, to present this report. After hearing the arguments of Mr. Downey, Secretary McNamara stated:

I have never received a more thorough and comprehensive and more thoughtful presentation. . . .

Because of this impressive presentation, Secretary McNamara subsequently ordered a private consulting firm to conduct a comprehensive study of the Springfield Armory operation to determine the feasibility of its continuation. In its report in November 1965, even this firm concluded that closure of the armory would result in definitely marginal cost savings. However, because of other policy consideration, this firm also recommended closing the armory.

The Massachusetts congressional delegation and the Springfield Technical Committee again challenged this decision and carried the case to the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee. During intensive hearings on March 22, 1966, the Springfield Technical Committee and Mr. Downey presented their costs analyses and arguments. As a result, the chairman recommended that the Secretary of Defense review the closure decision in light of the impressive data put forth by the Springfield Technical Committee and Mr. Downey.

The Defense Department in the reply of Deputy Secretary of Defense Cyrus Vance confirmed the Department's original decision stating:

None of the cost charts displayed by the Technical Committee at the 22 March hearing were (sic) accurate.

It was further indicated that the people who had prepared the cost charts had not acted objectively.

Mr. President, I feel the Department of Defense has, by this reply, questioned the character and integrity of Mr. Downey and the Springfield Technical Committee. These men have given long hours of their private time to present,

in the words of Secretary McNamara, a thorough and thoughtful case to the American people. Their only aim was to demonstrate that the closure of the Springfield Armory was not in our Nation's interest.

Because the Defense Department has maintained its position, the Massachusetts congressional delegation, the Springfield Technical Committee, and the people of Springfield have agreed that the wisest course of action now is to plan for the future private use of this facility.

Consequently, Mr. Downey and the members of the Springfield Technical Committee will be working with Defense Department officials, civic leaders, and officers from private industry to bring about conversion of the Springfield Armory facilities to private production. It is essential that there be no doubt regarding the ability and integrity of Mr. Downey and the members of the Springfield Technical Committee.

These men and women have given selflessly of their time for 18 months to serve our Nation's welfare. These men and women deserve our admiration and esteem. I think the Defense Department should correct the impression it has so unfortunately made.

#### PEACE CAN YIELD FATTER PROFITS THAN WAR

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, does war help the economy? In a recent survey, 54 percent of Americans said "Yes," and there can be no doubt that many intelligent people elsewhere in the world suspect this to be our outlook, and find it cause for mistrusting us.

The truth is just the opposite: war, and the Vietnam war in particular, hurt the modern economy which depends upon stability, not the overtaxation of wartime demands. In an interview with Look magazine's senior editor, T. George Harris, Dr. Pierre Rinfret, economic advisor to business, lays out the facts which prove the point. Rinfret points out:

In practical terms, wealth invested in war goods might as well be sunk in the ocean. Tanks and fighters do not produce new wealth. Teachers and factories do. Peace is the environment in which the flower of free enterprise grows, flourishes and bears fruit.

Rinfret expects the Vietnam war to result in a recession in 1967 if war-created expansion levels off. Without the war, he says, the economy would reach greater heights in 1968 than those the war now makes likely.

Whether Rinfret's predictions come true again, as they have in the past, only time will tell, but the article "Peace Can Yield Fatter Profits Than War" from the May 31 edition of Look should help lay to rest the popular myth that war "makes for good times." The "good times" are like an all-night binge: they must be paid for the next morning.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### VIETNAM'S ECONOMIC LESSON: PEACE CAN YIELD FATTER PROFITS THAN WAR

(By T. George Harris, Look senior editor)

On a hot night in Saigon not long ago, reporters in combat boots held a martini seminar to consider the war's cost in goods and lives. One U.S. correspondent, just back from a tank attack in the hills, doubted that "this kind of thing can be paid for forever." He was hooted down. "All it's doing is taking the slack out of the American economy," said an English writer. He shares the European dogma that Yankee business needs to feed on the blood of war to stay healthy.

Back in the States, innocent millions hold roughly the same thought. University of Michigan pollsters have asked people in key U.S. counties how Vietnam will affect business conditions, and them. A majority—54 percent—expect their family budgets to benefit from a war-stimulated boom. It will, our adults feel, "make for good times."

If you belong to that majority, you need a visit with my tough-minded friend, Dr. Pierre Rinfret, 42, economic advisor to a blue-chip stack of corporations. He has been betting his hefty reputation, plus \$4 billion worth of pension and other investment funds he manages, on a simple premise: "Vietnam doesn't mean boom. It means trouble."

Rinfret believes we have come quietly to an economic pivot point as important to the history of war as the first atom bomb. Though men and women still talk "wartime prosperity," we have at last broken, he insists, the ancient bond between war and prosperity. Already on the Vietnam casualty list, little noticed, is the tradition that arms spending fattens the bulls of the upswing and the "threat of peace" brings out the bears of the downswing. From here on, the old war bulls and peace bears will scramble to swap places.

"War is bearish," Rinfret bellows, or coos, at startled company chiefs. "Peace is bullish."

Why? Because, he says, "of a major revolution in capitalism." In the New Economics—pop label for national policy today—the home office of capitalism has gained the skill to guide its growth rate, plus the political will to do nothing less. The Federal Government can, and has to, keep the economy running in peacetime at its most productive rate. Result: War, once a shot in the arm to lagging business, now throws a shock into a smoothly functioning system set for peak long-term growth. To compound the shock, war also wastes resources, human and material, that would otherwise flow back each year to expand the economy and, through it, better the lives of men.

"In practical terms, wealth invested in war goods might as well be sunk in the ocean," says bullnecked Rinfret. "Tanks and fighters do not produce new wealth. Teachers and factories do. Peace is the environment in which the flower of free enterprise grows, flourishes and bears fruit. Peace is now the stable ground of prosperity."

This economist, one of the freethinkers of big business, speaks with more passion than a Vietnik at a peace rally. He earned his doctorate on a Fulbright grant in France, once grew a beard to bug the Brooks Bros. types. Expert in Marxian economics, he is, however, a robust Republican who supports the Johnson Administration's Viet policy because "the Communists gave us no choice." For hawk and dove alike, he feels, the crisis revises ideas about war, wealth and nations.

"Capitalism has stolen the march on communism," he says with delight. "Marx taught that capitalism is chaos, and has to keep itself alive on war. Communism, Marx argued, would use central authority to order the planned development of economic mankind. A curious thing has now happened. Capitalism has bought the case against chaos, but rejected Marx's system. We aren't stuck

June 1, 1966

with a single master plan. We have thousands of different plans, not all of which will be wrong at one time. In our steady growth and flexibility, we now have far greater stability than communism."

Rinfret's opinions on basic trends would be less compelling if he didn't make such a fat living (he's 5' 10½", 202 lbs.) out of them. More than any other private citizen, he gets his views tested every workday by the precise gauges of the marketplace. He is board chairman and boss thinker of Lionel D. Edie & Company, a top firm of economic consultants with 134 corporate customers. So he tells business chiefs what's ahead in their businesses, and they, investing billions, don't tolerate mistakes.

Most economic forecasters sell cagey doubletalk. This rowdy near-genius revels in taking an unpopular stand on hard numbers and watching events confirm him. "We don't equivocate," he says. "We lay it on the line."

In early '57, when many businessmen thought they were taking off toward the "Soaring 'Sixties," he sneered that they would instead wade painfully toward the "Soggy 'Sixties." On existing policies and population trends, he forecast the '57 recession, more frequent waverings to follow and a slower growth rate well into the 'Sixties.

And that's the way we went until 1963, when John F. Kennedy proposed to "get the country moving" with a whopping tax cut. (See *Mr. Tax Cut*, Look, June 18, 1963.) Businessmen balked, spooked by the thought of a deliberate deficit. Rinfret understood the deeper issue, and badgered his conservative clients to back the Democratic President's bill. It treated sales and profits as the sources of economic growth and proposed to expand total demand through private buying, not bigger Federal programs. "It's based," he said then, "on purely capitalistic principles." The President's advisers borrowed Rinfret's technical charts to help sell the tax cut to Congress.

The tax cut came through better than the Pony Express. Up charged the economy into the longest growth period ever known. The ghost of John Maynard Keynes, father of modern economic thought, came vividly alive in the New Economics—which was old hat to economists, brave new stuff to politicians. Men were using the dismal science to drive the snakes of uncertainty out of business.

The banishing of uncertainty brings confidence, and confidence brings basic changes in the economy. Consumers become less afraid to live it up. Not many months after the big tax cut, with Medicare already in the air, one Edie & Co. customer reported an unexpected surge in its car sales, mostly to people over 40. Many other buying habits began to shift, upward. Why? "Prolonged prosperity and the conviction that it's here to stay," noted Rinfret, "has a snowball effect." He also knew that, in addition to the two-stage tax cut's lasting help, the economy would get a boost from population trends. Not only was the postwar baby crop growing to the family-making age, but for the first time in years, we were to have a net increase in the age bracket, 40-to-44, that earns and spends the most money. "The middle-aged," Rinfret saw, "are making up for their youth."

"Hell, we're going to have a boom on top of a boom, he told me late in '64. He forecast a bigger jump in the Gross National Product than any other big-name pro. Chomping his Corona, he huffed at others for predicting a mid-'65 slump. Rinfret had it right. By last September, his survey of corporate plans to expand showed a boom so big that many pros could not believe the figures.

The argument over the future growth rate led to disagreement over the economics of peace and war. When U.S. spending on Vietnam rose sharply last fall, war became

the easy dodge for those who had not seen the peaceful pressures for boom. A best-selling academic explained business optimism in one sentence: "The new deciding factor is the escalation of war in Vietnam." His statement comforted all who think our economy still feeds on war. In Moscow, *Pravda* used it to headline a story: "Death Merchants Count Profits."

Rinfret saw it the other way around. Certain that the system was already straining toward the limits of its capacity, he feared the overload of weapons orders. "We're tight as a drum, and this will blow off the top." He also found out that the rise in war spending would be at least \$8 billion, much of it hidden by accounting tricks and some of it to be admitted later in special appropriations.

"We'll have a salami budget—one slice at a time," he said in December. "The stock market will soon figure out that the Government has to slap down on inflation, but nobody knows how hard. That means uncertainty."

He turned around and sold hundreds of millions worth of high-priced stock well in advance of the market's February plunge. Setting cash aside, he resolved to go on a buying spree when the war is stabilized—or peace breaks out.

He feared, however, that Vietnam would destroy the U.S. hope for steady, long-term growth into the late 'Sixties and early 'Seventies. "Sixty-six is dangerous," he said. "If we don't have the guts to face it, the economy will crack apart and get sicker than it was in the middle 'Fifties. Right now, we'll make or break the next five-year trend."

Heckling both business and Government, he worked over clients eager for price boosts. "You're greedy," he told one basic manufacturer, who soon ended up in a price battle, losers with the White House. "You'll bring on big wage demands, maybe direct controls. You'd better live with the verbal, jawbone controls the President is using now."

Then he tangled with the President himself. The issue: How much was industry actually going to spend on new plants? Edie & Co.'s survey of big companies, having spotted the makings of a peaceful boom last September, indicated by February that our Viet buildup had piled on a dangerous extra. It showed manufacturers raising plant construction by 32 percent, half again as much as the Government was expecting. President Johnson, who had previously cited Rinfret data as gospel, took a public swipe at this embarrassing new evidence of economic overload. "One does not debate with the President," retorted the forecaster. "Nevertheless, we'll stand by our figures." The President soon backed away, in effect, by jawboning for restraint in factory building.

The danger has now become clear. If the war causes industry to create too much capacity, a leveling off in war demand will shut hundreds of factories and cut off further plant building. The result will be an "overcapacity" recession far rougher than those brought on in the 'Fifties by nothing worse than inflated inventories. "We can't sustain this growth rate in the long haul," says Rinfret. "We'll pay for it later, in a dead economy. By this fall, you'll hear a lot of yelling about recession. The war makes us unstable."

The Johnson Administration can, with businessmen's help, keep the crisis in bounds. All of us feel Johnson's pressure right now in the bigger tax withholdings from our paychecks. LBJ has plenty more muscle. In addition to tax bites, tight money and a hammerlock on the budget, he knows dozens of sneaky pressure points: slow processing of FHA mortgage applications, delay in paying bills and a deliberate squeeze in every area where bureaucracy reaches the private

sector. But most politicians doubt that Democrats will do this unpopular job joyfully in an election year.

Worse yet, the political split over Vietnam policy makes for fudging on the economic front. Conservatives, all-out for action in Vietnam, are slow to admit its cost at home. Liberals, eager to pass more Great Society programs—now!—have been dismally slow to admit how badly the economy is strained. And both sides seem uneasy in this strange new world in which war itself, no longer a practical stimulant, produces neither hidden benefits nor the chance to cry against war profits. Perhaps too many of us are silenced by the knowledge that we have been accidental beneficiaries of past wars. Even Negroes, left out of most breaks, got their first fair chance at factory jobs in World War II.

There is, happily, one irresistible force pushing in the right direction: Lyndon Johnson's ego. He is not running this year, but he will be up in '68. If he lets the economy blow the roof off now, it will fall back too hard in '67 to be raised by November '68. But if he holds the lid down for the rest of this year, he can keep the '67 recession shallow, and we will be back on the healthy, peaceful growth curve by voters' day, '68. The President's advisers, I find, have explained the arithmetic to him.

To show what's ahead, forecaster Rinfret has projected the President's alternatives for Look (see chart below). [Chart not printed in Record.] We've been riding the top line into danger. But what is good for the country in this situation is just as good for LBJ, and he's begun to look like a strong man, with both the jawbone and the hold-down powers of his office.

The power to control economic growth, or to fail to, is, in a quiet way, as shocking as the power to command nuclear weapons. Both give fallible men the capacity—and with it, the necessity—to make deliberate decisions that nobody may be wise enough to make. Yet, for Lyndon Johnson, the promise is as great as the menace. He has the chance, with luck, to turn the New Economics into a practical equivalent of war.

#### A NATIONAL EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION VIEW ON VENEZUELA

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, National Educational Television has given its audience many valuable insights into major issues of our times. One recent production—"Venezuela, Last Chance for Democracy"—was especially timely and helpful to anyone who wishes to understand the deep-rooted challenges confronting the Alliance for Progress and other efforts to strengthen democracy in South America by improving the lives of its people.

NET and its series on the "Changing World" are to be commended for this latest production. I ask unanimous consent to have the transcript of the production printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A COMPLETE TRANSCRIPT OF NATIONAL EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION'S CHANGING WORLD #12: VENEZUELA—LAST CHANCE FOR DEMOCRACY  
From: National Educational Television, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, New York 10019.

This documentary report from Venezuela—the richest country in Latin America and the number one target for communist activity—is the story of people, described by a Latin American journalist as "the faceless ones"—the people who will decide ultimately



year. The question which is not easy to answer is: Where will the fish meal be found to meet a demand which has not stopped growing with the fish catch?

This is a world fish meal problem which will, no doubt, be anxiously discussed when manufacturers gather in Cape Town in April for the yearly conference of the International Association of Fish Meal Manufacturers.

In the meantime what of Peru and the still callow giant of an industry nourished by the anchoveta? Many of the country's 150 or so fish meal factories and some 1,700 boats supplying them must be feeling the effects of the 1965 decline. Even in record 1964 Peruvian plants overall were working at only about 65 per cent of capacity.

As any fish meal plant owner or operator will explain, factories of the type operating in the major fish meal countries are expensive to set up and carry high fixed costs. They are geared to large-scale production of abundant raw material and, unless the factory owner has accumulated reserve funds, a drop in the catch quickly sends up the danger signs. For Peru, therefore, the next few years may be a period of factory closings far more rapid than have been taking place since an earlier period of consolidation in 1962 and 1963.

Unfortunately for Peru the boom in anchoveta has not extended to other fish species. Writing in the *Yearbook of the Peruvian fishing magazine Pesca*, marine biologist Isaac Vasquez points out that 98 per cent of total landings in 1964 consisted of anchoveta. In recent years an effort has been made with the assistance of FAO to develop other fishing activities along the South American west coast. But there is no apparent substitute for the little fish which gave us the most astonishing of all fishing booms and which now seems to have no more surprises to offer.

#### SOME PERTINENT COMMENTS ON VIETNAM

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, as confusion becomes compounded in South Vietnam and the folly of our military involvement there grows more evident with the steady growth of that involvement, it is pertinent and useful to include some diverse comments which point up some of the unfortunate concomitants of our misguided entry into a civil war which did not jeopardize or involve our security or national interest.

Three recently published articles deserve to be read. They are first, "Another Turn of the Screw," by Walter Lippmann; second, "The Costs of War in Civilian Skills," by Marquis Childs; and third, "No Exit Government," by Joseph Kraft, all from recent issues of the *Washington Post*.

I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the *Record*, and urge their reading by both my colleagues and others.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

[From the *Washington Post*, May 31, 1966]  
TODAY AND TOMORROW—ANOTHER TURN OF THE SCREW

(By Walter Lippmann)

Now even the semblance of American aloofness and impartiality in the internal affairs of South Vietnam has disappeared and the United States is giving General Ky military and moral support in fighting his opponents at home. In Washington at least, though perhaps not in Saigon, the Administration would have preferred to keep its hands off the

internal conflict, and to be regarded as waiting dispassionately for the verdict of the South Vietnamese voters in the promised elections. But the Administration in Washington has not controlled what happens in Saigon. Against its will, contrary to its hopes, perhaps contrary even to its own orders, it has become inextricably entangled with the actions of the Ky government.

The development is not surprising. Indeed it was bound to occur, and no one not the victim of the official illusions could ever have supposed that there could be an independent government in Saigon or free elections in South Vietnam while the preponderant military and economic power in the country is foreign. It does not follow that General Ky is a United States puppet, and that Ambassador Lodge pulls the strings. It can easily be, and indeed it is, that General Ky is pulling the strings and that Ambassador Lodge has now to respond.

For the situation in South Vietnam is becoming more uncontrolled as it becomes more tangled, and it is increasingly doubtful whether the Administration can exercise any decisive influence in Vietnam beyond the reach of the guns of its troops. Increasingly it is true that the United States controls only the ground on which its soldiers stand. There can be little question that in supporting General Ky we have opened up a widening gulf between ourselves and the Buddhists. It will not be easy to close it. For General Ky has identified himself with an interminable war for victory and with a regime of corruption and privilege and inefficiency while the interminable war goes on. Yet we cannot replace him. It is impossible to see our forces doing almost all the fighting and at the same time providing good government in the thousands of villages of Vietnam.

Although the situation is bad and our entanglement is deep and dangerous, it would not be impossible, even now, to regain control of our intervention to shape events for a rational solution. But this cannot be done by a President who thinks that any course of action different from the one he is taking is "abject surrender." In the realm of statesmanship, to believe that is to be a defeatist.

Losing control of the war can lead to an irresistible demand in this country to go all out by using airpower to destroy North Vietnam and the Vietcong territory in South Vietnam. Or, if the President rejects this catastrophic solution, losing control of the war can mean that South Vietnam will come apart at the seams and will become unravelled as a state capable of waging war.

To regain control of the American intervention the President will have to set limits on our purposes and on the power we are willing to commit to them. Now any serious setting of limits is tantamount to adopting the holding strategy which General Gavin and General Ridgway have advised us to use. With a limitation of forces there must necessarily be a limitation of our objectives. Even if we fix the military commitment at the high level of 400 thousand men, we must reduce our present objectives which are to reconquer the whole territory so completely that General Ky's junta is able to govern it.

Such a limitation on our means and ends would not be abject surrender. It would be honorable in that it would provide asylum for the Vietnamese who need it or want it, and it would be enormously significant in that it would without fail set in motion the negotiations which we profess to desire.

For if we take the position that we will not use unlimited American forces to conquer and occupy the whole of South Vietnam, and at the same time we say that we will not evacuate Vietnam without a political agreement, the Vietnamese themselves will soon be compelled to negotiate their own arrangements.

[From the *Washington (D.C.) Post*, May 30, 1966]

#### THE COSTS OF WAR IN CIVILIAN SKILLS (By Marquis Childs)

Part of the cost of the spreading conflict in Vietnam can be lumped under the heading of the brain drain. The military to one side, the concentration of brains, skill, ability in Southeast Asia has put a strain on a half-dozen civilian agencies.

Roughly one-tenth of the total American staff of the United States Information Agency is there. The State Department, the Central Intelligence Agency and other branches of government are feeling the pinch. More often than not the ablest and most dedicated men are singled out for service in Vietnam.

Agencies such as Agriculture and Health, Education and Welfare, charged with a share in the program of rehabilitation, must assign experts to the difficult task of trying to rebuild the countryside and win the allegiance of the peasantry as the war continues. The inroads of disease—with a new virulent form of malaria that defies normally effective drugs and viral hepatitis—are taxing medical resources in Vietnam, both civilian and military. As the President's economy drive pinches the budgets of most agencies the demands growing out of the Vietnam commitment cut deeper into normal functions and the responsibilities of government at home and abroad.

It is in foreign policy that the consequences are felt most acutely. The number of hours spent on Vietnam by the President's principal advisers add up to an overwhelming total. This means, along with the drain of skilled and able manpower, the neglect of other vital areas of American involvement.

Certain of the President's advisers are aware of how costly this can be. With government resources and public attention concentrated on Southeast Asia the slippage in other areas goes almost unnoticed. There are signs that the Soviet Union is taking advantage of this country's absorption in a war that will shortly see 400,000 American troops on the ground in Asia.

The Middle East is a prime example. A blowup can come this summer. The degree to which Premier Aleksei Kosygin backed President Gamal Abdel Nasser during Kosygin's recent visit to Cairo is not clear. But the Soviet Union has provided Egypt with massive arms aid and has made loans available up to a half-billion dollars for the Aswan dam.

Nasser continues to keep more than 50,000 troops in Yemen. Knowledgeable observers here fear that he may launch a direct attack on Saudi Arabia over control of the primitive desert state belatedly moving out of the remote past. This could involve Jordan, since King Hussein has aligned his nation with Saudi Arabia.

In 1958 President Eisenhower ordered 10,000 Marines into Lebanon at the request of the Lebanese government. The area was in an uproar with leftists in Iraq violently overthrowing a Western-oriented government. Lebanon today is said to be far more stable. Yet if a request should come from, say, Jordan or Saudi Arabia for help in the face of an Egyptian attack, with the threat of the whole area going up in flames, American resources would be strained in view of the ever-widening Vietnam commitment.

Africa is another area in which the drift of events can present Washington with grim, if not impossible, choices. Increasingly the militancy of black Africa is directed at the remaining enclaves of white supremacy, notably South Africa and Rhodesia. The President's initiative in his address to the ambassadors representing the Organization of African Unity was a recognition of the need for a new approach.

June 1, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

11451

It has become clear, was protecting her borders while she rapidly developed her own society. In general, Russia succeeded. And it is now also clear that the strongest barrier to Russian national expansion is the national identity of neighboring states which, even under Communist governments, resist absorption and seek peaceful relations with both East and West.

One frequently hears that the United States is doing in Viet Nam what it did in Greece under the Truman Doctrine—building a barrier of armed power against a Communist tide rolling on toward world conquest; and it is assumed that our stand in Greece triumphed. The truth is we might be engaged there yet had not Tito closed the Communist supply route after falling out with Stalin. In other words, what saved Greece was not primarily our military and economic power but the indigenous nationalism of Communist Yugoslavia.

The one great lesson of the cold war with Russia is that national interests, and not Communist ideology, are controlling on both sides. The Russians, like the Chinese, have talked a lot about their revolution some day embracing the world, but at the critical points they have invariably acted in behalf of Russian interests rather than of Marxist dogma.

National interests can be accommodated, when the will to reconcile them exists on both sides. By and large, the United States and Russia have learned after 20 years of cold war that their conflicts must be reconciled—that in the nuclear age neither can undertake an ideological war against the other. Only the Viet Nam issue stands in the way of a steady improvement in relations that would, in effect, end the cold war with Russia.

Can we not apply these lessons of the past to our future with China? Must we go through another period of ideological conflict in which vast portions of our national energies are devoted to military power at the expense of our social and cultural development?

We must now possess, many times over, the military power necessary to defend ourselves and to deter overt aggression anywhere. It would be a national tragedy if, nevertheless, we embarked on a new nuclear arms race and a series of peripheral wars designed to "contain" Chinese Communism by military encirclement. Ideas cannot be so contained. Revolutions cannot be permanently suppressed with guns. Not all revolutions are against our national interest. We cannot impose our will everywhere, and we defeat our purposes by trying. The way to meet Communist boasts of coming world revolution is not to believe them, but to help free peoples create the conditions that make Communism impossible.

Just as we have learned at great cost and hazard to live at peace with Russia, we shall some day have to make up our minds to accept Red China's existence, to respect her legitimate interests, to meet her challenge by other means than military containment. It would be the part of wisdom to make this decision before, rather than after, another 20 years of cold war and arms race. Mankind may not get a second chance to avoid nuclear suicide.

#### FISHERY CONSERVATION NEEDS OF THE WORLD

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have spoken often on this floor on the subject of the fishery conservation needs of the world. I feel very deeply about this and am constantly heartened by growing world opinion and concern that the high seas operations of many of the coastal and fishing nations are not being

operated with enough regard for the future.

Today, off the coast of my State, as well as off Oregon and Alaska, huge Soviet fleets are harvesting the fishery resources above the Continental Shelf; and it is my conviction that the conservation consideration is inadequate. The very fact that this huge fleet has spread down from the Bering Sea, first to the Gulf of Alaska, then to British Columbia, then Washington, and finally Oregon, is ample evidence that depletion is being left in its wake. There are now explorations by Soviet vessels off the coast of California, and it is quite obvious that a fleet will soon be working in those waters as well.

Mr. President, we cannot afford to glibly cast off the fishermen's complaints of fishery depletion by these foreign fleets on the assumption that we do not know the conservation requirements of our coastal stocks. The Soviet and Japanese fleets have been operating for more than 5 years in the Gulf of Alaska, and the fact that they would now journey so much further to fish off Oregon is ample demonstration that the yield has seriously declined. It is my feeling that we must move to protect our special interest as a coastal State and accept our responsibilities toward the conservation of the fishery resources.

We should learn by experience, and we have such experience in this area of fishery conservation. There is a recent example for our consideration.

The leading nation in world fishery production on the basis of the most recent Food and Agricultural Organization statistics is our South American neighbor Peru. In 1958, the fabulous offshore fishery for anchoveta was close to 1 million tons, and 3 years later it had reached the unbelievable total of 5½ million tons with some 840,000 tons of meal entering the world market. In 1964, that nation exported a total of 1.426 million tons.

But today, Mr. President, Peru's grasp of the No. 1 production position in world fisheries is faltering, and I would suggest that recent declines may be the result of overfishing. More important, perhaps, is the uncertainty of the situation; we really do not know whether the fishery off Peru has merely reached a sort of production plateau at around 8 million tons, or whether the production may decline and evaporate as with the California sardine.

It is increasingly obvious to me that the coastal and fishery nations of the world must hasten to the conference table, not to further selfish individual desires by garnering more fishery stocks for themselves, but to take a long, hard and practical look at the ocean resources as we know them and to come forward with some conservation rationale in the interest of mankind.

Mr. President, I pray for the day when America's fishery industry may take its rightful place in this question of world production. But I do not wish for the United States to do so at the sacrifice of a resource.

We have a responsibility to the entire world in this question of fishery conservation, and I am convinced that others

will be prepared to meet their responsibilities in this regard when we can sit down at the conference table. As you know, the State Department is now proceeding with plans for a World Fisheries Conference, as suggested unanimously in resolution by this body more than 3 years ago. The State Department action is long overdue, but that department of government should reassess its timetable, with a determination to bring the conference about even sooner than present plans dictate. There is no time for delay.

Mr. President, as I mentioned earlier in my remarks, others are becoming concerned about this conservation problem. The British fishery trade journal, *Fishing News International*, has regularly called attention to such world needs.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *Record* the text of that publication's recent editorial on the problems in Peru.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

#### PERU, FISH MEAL AND THE END OF AN ERA

In the Peruvian fish meal industry the end of an era may have been reached. With this observation the US Embassy in Lima rounded off a review written in September last year of the short- and long-term outlook for the industry. Events since then have tended to confirm that the soaring rocket that has been the Peruvian fish meal industry since the middle 1950's has levelled off in its flight. In future the strongest influence on it may well be the gravitational pull of a pelagic shoal fish resource exploited very near to or perhaps even beyond safe limits.

A fishing world conditioned almost to planned developments, restrains in the interests of conservation and other such influences stared agog at the fishery explosion that took place in Peru. Growth is too mild a word to describe what happened there. It was a rampant, joyous surge of free enterprise. Suddenly the small anchoveta, which had contributed only about 30 per cent of a yearly catch around 130,000 tons, became the most exciting of all fish pulled out of the oceans.

By 1958 Peru's catch was touching one million tons; three years later a 5½ million ton catch had pushed 840,000 tons of fish meal into world markets. In those three years the amount of meal in international trade rose from 657,000 tons to 1,350,000 tons. Prices tumbled and one major exporting country alone dropped £1 million in earnings from a higher catch.

While this alarmed meal exporting countries, its long-term effect was to open up a vast new market. The lower prices encouraged previous importers to use more meal in their growing output of fortified feeds; new buyers appeared and by 1964, even with exports at 2.4 million tons and total world production at 3.8 million tons, the price was reaching its pre-1961 level. By then 30 per cent of the world's catch was being fed into reduction plants, compared with 15 per cent ten years before. Other fishing nations—Norway, Iceland, Chile and South and South West Africa—were all contributing to the rise in production. But Peru, with exports in 1964 of 1.426 million tons, was the colossus in markets which were already taking all the meal available.

Now the halt appears to have come. During the last three months of 1965 there was the expected drop in the Peru catch and this may level off at around eight million tons a

The growing tension throughout black Africa is related to the drift in the United Nations. Control in the U.N. is passing to peoples of color under the one-nation, one-vote rule. With the prospect of the admission of Red China in the not-too-distant future the domination by Asian and African nations aimed at the little plateau of white superiority, as gauged by the economic indices, is an ominous portent for the U.N.

This has been Ambassador Arthur Goldberg's increasing concern. But he finds it difficult to get attention focused in Washington on what can happen to the U.N. Goldberg has scarcely concealed his unhappiness over certain administration policies.

The plain fact is that resources of trained and able civilians, as well as the supply of money, are limited. The more they are drawn into the vortex of Vietnam the fewer there are for other urgent needs.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 30, 1966]

#### INSIGHT AND OUTLOOK—NO EXIT GOVERNMENT (By Joseph Kraft)

Marshal Ky's show of force in Danang and Hue has been hailed by his admirers in the Saigon Embassy, the State Department and the press as a great success. But for whom?

Not, certainly for the United States. For the chief result of the recent events is to identify the American stake even more closely to the fate of the Ky regime. But whatever its immediate ups and downs, the Ky government is a no-exit government—a government without a future.

It cannot fight a war. Still less can it pacify the country in the wake of American military success. Least of all can it work out an agreement with the other side.

The basic weakness of the Ky regime is that it is not a government so much as a ramshackle collection of opportunists who have risen to the top through a crazy succession of military coups. Far from working together on government business accordingly, the chief military figures in the regime tend to pursue their own private and local interests. And nothing shows it better than the basic military command built around the four Army Corps.

The III Corps around Saigon, because of its proximity to the capital, has in general been responsive to central direction. But the I Corps has been mainly taken up, one way or another, with the Buddhists. The IV Corps in the rich delta region has been largely a fief for the accumulation of personal fortunes. The II Corps, embracing the highland district, the scene of most of the American military activity, has been much the same.

In these circumstances, morale in the Vietnamese army has steadily sunk. Desertions, which are mainly cases of men going home, have been running at the rate of at least 7500 per month. The capacity and interest of the Vietnamese army in fighting the war have dropped accordingly. And thus it happens that Americans are doing most of the fighting and now absorbing most of the casualties.

The weaknesses that debar the Ky regime from waging the war effectively are even more critical when it comes to pacification. For pacification involves chiefly winning the confidence of local people through civil police actions and social reforms.

But the Ky regime, after the fashion of most military regimes, has only contempt for the civil police function; the police remain among the poorest paid and worst trained officials in South Vietnam. As to social reforms, they are constantly being obstructed and diluted by the corruption endemic in the regime. Even absent corruption, the true condition of social reform is the one thing the Ky regime seems unable

to admit—that is a freely elected civil government with popular support.

Lastly, with respect to wrapping the war up through negotiations, the Ky regime is doing so poorly in fighting and in pacification, that the insurgents are bound to believe that time is working on their side. The transparent ineptitude of the regime, in other words, can only encourage the rebels to step up their activities—the more so as they must now see the prospect of enlisting some of the Buddhists.

Moreover, even if the time came when the other side was ready to negotiate, the Ky regime would constitute an insuperable obstacle to talks. Most of its leading members, including Marshal Ky himself, fail to pass the acid test of nationalism. In the Indo-Chinese struggle for independence, they fought with the French against their own people. It is not thinkable that the Vietnamese, or Hanoi, or Peking would deal with such men.

In these circumstances, it is sheer folly for American officials to celebrate Marshal Ky's victories and to imagine that some glowing future presents itself. The fact is that Marshal Ky's victories are American defeats. The American interest at this juncture is to take distances from Marshal Ky, while searching for occasions to promote a shuffle in the Saigon government. The truth is that so long as the Ky regime stays in power, for so long, the United States will be obliged to intensify its own war effort.

#### FEDERAL DOSSIER

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, recently I commented on a Federal Data Center that is being considered, into which all Government-held information about individual citizens would be fed. Such a center would take from Americans any chance they might have for individualism. The citizen would become merely a number and much of his life's history could be retrieved from the computer.

Last Sunday's Outlook section of the Washington Post contained a most interesting article entitled "There's a Dossier on You," written by Richard Harwood. Mr. Harwood points out that an enormous industry has been created in the United States for the purpose of compiling dossiers on our innocent citizens.

Mr. Harwood suggests Government "security" reports on private citizens often end up in the hands of private employers and vice versa.

Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure is presently investigating this so-called Federal Data Center, and we intend to hold hearings on this "dossier concept" in the near future.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the article published in the Washington Post of May 29, 1966.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THESE ARE DOSSIERS ON YOU—IT MIGHT NOT BE IN CIA OR FBI FILES; IT MIGHT ONLY BE FHA'S CHECK ON MARITAL STABILITY

(By Richard Harwood)

On an ordinary working day, the Federal Housing Administration puts away in its files "confidential" reports on the marital stability of approximately 4,000 prospective home buyers. More than a million of these reports were collected for the Government

last year by private investigating agencies whose assignment is to spot people likely to wind up in a divorce court.

Their snooping is done so discreetly (and often so superficially) that few if any FHA loan applicants are aware that their domestic problems are the subject of public interest. If one asks what interest the Government has in, say, the indiscretions of an Arlington suburbanite, he is given an answer worthy of the counting house:

"The reputation and marital amicability of an applicant for a mortgage loan . . . are a vital part of our risk determination. One of the leading causes of foreclosure is divorce."

The same sort of logic is used to justify snooping of every description into the personal affairs of American citizens by both public and private institutions in our society.

"The ideal," as a security official at the Defense Department has put it, "is to eliminate risk in advance."

#### A SIX-MONTH BAG

In pursuit of this ideal, Defense has created an elaborate investigative apparatus which in a recent six-month period turned up 22 sexual perverts, three alcoholics and ten "psychiatric cases." They were all private citizens who required "security clearances" because their companies held defense contracts.

The military, of course, is not alone in this business. The Civil Service Commission spends more than half its budget probing into the lives of present and prospective jobholders. In the past five years it has discovered a dozen Communists and several thousand homosexuals, excessive drinkers and otherwise "immoral" people.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration inquires into every facet of the lives of its astronauts and their families and weighs the findings against the model "public image" it seeks. (The process broke down last year when an astronaut unpredictably was sued for divorce.)

The Passport Office demands detailed personal histories from all passport applicants who have been married more than twice. It also engages in a curious political surveillance program which, in theory at least, could deprive a Senator like J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT or WAYNE MORSE of the right to travel abroad.

The Immigration and Naturalization Service snoops on an international scale. It has dossiers on "sex-deviates," prostitutes, rapists and criminals in countries all over the world.

To harvest and handle information of this kind, an enormous industry has been created in the United States in the past 30 years. It spends hundreds of millions of dollars and engages the talents and inquisitive instincts of thousands. The Federal Government alone employs far more investigators than doctors—40,000-plus—although they are not all compiling personal dossiers.

The Retail Credit Co., largest of the private investigating concerns, grosses more than \$100 million a year from activities that have little to do with "retail credit." The Federal Civil Service Commission spends \$17 million a year on personnel investigations.

For the same purpose, Defense spent \$45 million last year, the Internal Revenue Service spent \$10.3 million, the Atomic Energy Commission spent \$5.6 million. The \$170 million FBI budget included about \$145 million for "security" and criminal investigations.

The fruit of these investments is tangible. The names and numbers of virtually all of us can be found in somebody's filing cabinet and for millions of us there are extensive life histories with intimate details of our sexual habits, friendships, financial affairs, oddities and political and religious beliefs.



June 1, 1966

## NO FBI MONOPOLY

One automatically thinks, in this connection, of the FBI with 175½ million sets of fingerprints, its bulky dossiers on 11,000 Communist Party members and 100,000 Communist "sympathizers" and its supersecret list of people to be arrested immediately in the event of war. But the FBI has no monopoly in these affairs.

The Retail Credit Co.'s 7,000 investigators maintain dossiers on 42 million people at any given time. Some of them contain such incriminating information that they are kept under lock and key in the offices of the company's top personnel.

The Defense Department has a central index of 21.5 million name cards plus 14 million life histories compiled in the course of its security investigations. The disclosure of information in its possession could wreck the lives and careers of thousands of men and women.

The Civil Service Commission has the same power. Its files include eight million secret dossiers on people investigated for Federal employment. They contain thousands of allegations (and in many cases proof) of "criminal conduct," "immoral conduct," "dishonest conduct," and "notoriously disgraceful and infamous conduct."

The Credit Bureau, Inc., the largest of Washington's credit-rating companies, has records on 2.5 million past and present residents and has access to millions of similar records in cities all over the United States. Its regular reports to the FBI and other Government agencies often are sufficiently damaging to cost a man his job. The FBI, for example, on the basis of Credit Bureau reports, weeded out a large number of people chosen to work for Sargent Shriver's Office of Economic Opportunity.

## AN ADMITTED THREAT

The Government's chief personnel investigator, Kimbell Johnson of the Civil Service Commission, is conscious of the power he and other investigators could wield.

"Whenever a bureaucracy amasses files about its citizens," he says, "an inherent threat to liberty exists."

Yale Prof. Staughton Lynd experienced this "threat" a few months ago when the State Department revoked his passport, in part, because of "anti-American statements" in his dossier. They had been collected by State Department investigators who trailed him to public meetings in this country and monitored his speeches for criticisms of American policy in Vietnam. These criticisms then became factors in the decision of the Passport Office to deny Lynd the liberty to travel abroad.

Another case involved Harvard Prof. H. Stuart Hughes, whose plans to visit Europe next fall were known months in advance to the FBI. Drawing on Hughes's political dossier, the FBI asked the State Department and United States agents overseas to place the professor under surveillance when he reached Europe.

These incidents suggest, if nothing else, that the sweep of the Government's investigative interests is far broader than a citizen might assume in a free society.

## SECURITY "OBLIGATION"

In both the public and private sectors of American life, investigations are defended in terms of the search for security and certitude. And institution, it is argued, has an obligation to know who it is hiring, who it is lending money to and who may threaten its existence.

The inherent dangers in the process are everywhere recognized. Retail Credit, for example, acknowledges that some of its dossiers would be a gold mine for blackmailers; hence, they are handled even within the agency like top-secret documents. Washington's Credit Bureau, Inc., uses a compli-

cated code system to prevent the information it holds from falling into the wrong hands. The FBI, Defense and the Civil Service Commission make a fetish of protecting their "raw files."

Thus, the investigators claim, dangers to the citizenry from snooping are minimal.

"No one need worry," one is told, "about the unauthorized use of his file."

The record, however, does not support this claim. What a man reveals about himself in an application for department store credit may later prove the crucial factor in the loss of a Government job. A "confidential" report discrediting a reporter for The Washington Post—which later proved to be totally false—went all the way from the State Department to the White House, the CIA, the Defense Department and, ultimately, to the managers of the newspaper.

Government "security" reports on private citizens often end up in the hands of private employers, and the reverse is true. The Civil Service Commission, the FBI and credit-rating agencies work hand in glove. The "confidential" FHA reports on applicants for housing loans are available to mortgage lenders for \$1.50.

## IN HIGH PLACES

Nor are disclosures of this kind always accidental. A President of the United States—having office in the 1960s—has discussed at "off-the-record" meeting with journalists the contents of a secret report on the sexual indiscretions of a Senator.

The governor of a Mid-South state has, within the past five years, tried to peddle to newsmen the Federal income tax returns of a political opponent. The same thing has happened with politicians in other states, notably Florida and Ohio.

If a visitor stumbles onto the right private detective in Washington, he may be shown photographs of a prominent political figure in bed with the wife of a prominent socialist. Getting information out of the "closed files" of the House Un-American Activities Committee is about as difficult as getting a weather report.

Just a couple of years ago, a foreign lobbyist obtained an HUAC report on the lobbying activities of a Senate staff member. The report was taken to the White House in an effort to discredit the staffer.

Whenever things of this sort occur, men of good will in Government or private industry respond with new suggestions for protecting the "sanctity" of the files. But it is obvious, as they concede, that so long as dossiers exist, they will be abused to one extent or another.

A trusted secretary in Johnson's office in the Civil Service Commission divulged a great deal of information about Government personnel to the late Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy (R-Wis.). She acted out of patriotic motives and she was finally fired. But the damage was done.

The more difficult question is whether the millions of dossiers piling up in Government and private offices are really necessary. How much does one need to know before hiring a man or lending him money? Not even the investigators have those answers.

The retail credit agencies, for example, acknowledge that even though credit is freer and easier today than at any other time in history, the loss rate from deadbeats remains infinitesimal. The FHA justifies its questions about marital stability in terms of the foreclosure problem. But it has no figures to support the claim that "one of the leading causes of foreclosure is divorce."

The CIA and the National Security Agency compel job applicants to take an offensive lie detector test that include such questions as: "Have you engaged in homosexual acts since the age of 16?" But there is great controversy over the value of these tests. The Civil Service Commission's John-

son has a low opinion of the polygraph. Even CIA people concede that it is useless when the subject is a congenital liar.

## A CRIPPLING PARADOX

To Johnson and Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense Walter Skallerup, the whole process of personnel investigation is distorted by the preoccupation with turning up "dirt." They urge a system aimed at discovering talent rather than spotless mediocrity.

Finally, there is a paradox in the present system that makes absolute "security" unattainable even if it were desirable in a free society. The people privy to the highest secrets of the Government and the men on whose judgment and emotional stability the world's fate may hang are exempt from the screenings of the investigators.

"Who," asked a CIA man not long ago, "is going to give Lyndon Johnson a polygraph test or a psychological examination?"

The members of Congress who deal with these matters are never checked out by the FBI. Psychologists do not probe the mind of the Secretary of Defense the way they probe the minds of some of his underlings.

## A DALLAS AFTERMATH

In the aftermath of President Kennedy's assassination, there was intense concern with the problem of presidential security. There were suggestions that thousands of potential security risks be arrested or at least confined to their homes whenever the President was traveling.

"That," J. Edgar Hoover replied, "is what you would call totalitarian security. I don't think you can have that kind of security in this country without having a great wave of criticism against it."

There are signs that a similar reaction is setting in against snooping. General Motors has promised that there will be no more Ralph Nader investigations. Secretary of State Dean Rusk has promised to curtail the surveillance of American citizens traveling abroad. The Civil Service Commission is having second thoughts about psychological testing. The President has ordered a curtailment of electronic eavesdropping.

Meanwhile, however, the dossiers continue to pile up in the offices of Government and industry. What will become of them, nobody knows.

## DEATH IN VIETNAM—CAPT. JOSEPH J. POLONKO, JR., OF PLUCKEMIN, N.J.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, a constituent of mine, Capt. Joseph J. Polonko, Jr., of Pluckemin, N.J., recently lost his life while serving on active duty in South Vietnam. A close friend of his has brought to my attention a letter he wrote, describing the life and work of Captain Polonko, to the Somerville Messenger-Gazette. This eloquent letter describes Captain Polonko's courageous service to his Nation and the outstanding job he did as a member of our Armed Forces presently assisting the Vietnamese people. I know that this letter will be of interest to my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARLINGTON, VA., May 7, 1966.  
EDITOR, SOMERVILLE MESSENGER-GAZETTE,  
Somerville, N.J.

DEAR SIR: On Friday, the sixth of May, 1966, Joseph J. Polonko, Jr., of Pluckemin, New Jersey, Somerville High School, Rutgers University, the United States Army, and Kien

June 1, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

11363

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF  
BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] be added to S. 3273, the Dairy Import Act of 1966, as a cosponsor at the next printing of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on the next printing of Senate Joint Resolution 148, the name of the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] be added as a cosponsor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill, S. 3107, to provide for a comprehensive review of national water resource problems and programs, and for other purposes, the names of Senators CHURCH and NELSON be added as cosponsors.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CIVIL  
RIGHTS

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, due to a viral infection recently suffered by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, hearings originally scheduled to commence June 2, 1966, on S. 3296, the administration's Civil Rights Act of 1966, six other civil rights bills, and an amendment to S. 3296, have been postponed for 4 days. Hearings have been rescheduled to begin June 6, 1966, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building. Arrangements made for the receipt of testimony are expected to remain the same.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTI-  
CLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE AP-  
PENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. JAVITS:

Address by Hon. Charles H. Silver, consultant to mayor of New York and president, Beth Israel Medical Center, delivered at dedication of Belle and Jack Linsky Pavilion, Beth Israel Medical Center, New York City.

By Mr. CHURCH:

Excerpts from speech, entitled "Public Affairs: The Demanding Seventies," delivered by Sol Linowitz, chairman of the board of the Xerox Corp., before a conference of the National Industrial Conference Board.

Review of the motion picture "Born Free," written by Richard Schickel, and printed in Life magazine of April 8, 1966.

By Mr. MORTON:

Editorial entitled "The Revisionists," published in the Washington Post of Thursday, May 26, 1966.

## NATIONAL FLAG WEEK

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, at the request of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Senator from

Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], I submit a resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 269) was read, considered, and agreed to as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Judiciary be, and hereby is, discharged from further consideration of the House joint resolution (H.J. Res. 763), authorizing the President to proclaim the week in which June 14 occurs as "National Flag Week."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 763.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 763) authorizing the President to proclaim the week in which June 14 occurs as National Flag Week.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, although June 14 is the date usually observed as Flag Day, it is observed in some States at different times. It has been suggested by a great many patriotic organizations that instead of fixing the date, we accept the week in which June 14 falls as the week in which to observe Flag Day; and this resolution calls on the President to make such a proclamation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading and passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 763) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

VN

## UNPOPULAR WAR

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in June 1965, 10 South Vietnamese generals spearheaded a military coup, overthrown the civilian government and then selected flamboyant Air Marshal Ky as Prime Minister. Unfortunately, as further evidence that the United States has become involved in a miserable civil war in Vietnam, the fact is that Ky was born and reared near Hanoi considerably north of the 17th parallel. Throughout the last 12 months that militarist regime, although supported by our Armed Forces and the CIA, has never won control over the major part of the area south of the 17th parallel and termed "South Vietnam" in the Geneva agreement. The facts are at the present time this militarist regime has only questionable control of one-fourth of the area of South Vietnam. Lacking the support of our Armed Forces and the CIA, Ky could not have maintained himself as Prime Minister. Ky very definitely is on his way out as Prime Minister.

At the Honolulu conference he was embraced by our President. Then he announced he was going to bring democracy to South Vietnam and hold elections in August. Despite the fact that our leaders tried to make a sweet-smelling geranium of Ky, throughout the entire period from the time of the military coup, he had never made any effort nor taken any steps whatever toward civilian rule to displace the militarists who seized power. In retrospect, the Honolulu conference, about which so much has been said by administration leaders, was an unfortunate episode in the recent history of our country.

With revolt and unrest growing daily in South Vietnam, it is evident Ky could not last as Prime Minister for even a few days except for our support. It is obvious that his time as Prime Minister is rapidly drawing to a close.

It is evident that this administration has involved our Nation in an unpopular war in Vietnam. There is no viable government in South Vietnam. Sallust, the Roman philosopher said:

It is always easy to begin a war, but very difficult to stop one, since its beginning and end are not under the control of the same man.

A recent editorial in the St. Louis Post Dispatch quoted Walter Lippmann's statement that it is becoming plainer every day that "The American intervention in South Vietnam is the most unpopular war within the memory of living Americans."

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, entitled "Unpopular War," be printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

## UNPOPULAR WAR

In his column the other day Walter Lippmann said what is becoming plainer every hour, that "The American intervention in South Vietnam is the most unpopular war within the memory of living Americans." Indicators such as academic demonstrations amply support this judgment; the Gallup poll shows public approval of the way President Johnson is handling the Vietnam situation continues to slip.

The basic reason for the American attitude is simply that the people are not persuaded the effort is either wise or necessary. They are not convinced a few Asian guerrillas 10,000 miles away constitute a genuine threat to the security of the United States. Should the United States be attacked, or genuinely threatened, by an adversary worthy of its steel, we are sure the people would rally just as they did after the attack on Pearl Harbor.

The unrealistic arguments of Administration spokesmen, and President Johnson's continued sniping at his critics, seem to us to be having the effect of increasing popular discontent. Mr. Johnson's speech to a Democratic fund-raising dinner in Chicago is a case in point. The President said the American effort would continue "until the gallant people of South Vietnam have their own choice of their own government." He spoke of aiding "this young nation."

Everyone who reads the newspapers knows this does not reflect the real situation. Even as Mr. Johnson spoke "the gallant people of South Viet Nam" were engaging in fratricidal strife. What began as a civil war between the Saigon regime and Communist-led guer-

11364

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

June 1, 1966

illas, with the United States supporting Saigon and North Viet Nam the guerrillas, was turning into a second civil war between the crumbling Saigon regime and dissident military, student and Buddhist factions in central Viet Nam.

In his Chicago address Mr. Johnson challenged "those who speak and write about Viet Nam to say clearly what other policy they would pursue," as though his critics had offered no constructive counsel. On the contrary, as the public knows, Mr. Johnson's critics have urged that the escalation of the war be stopped, that the bombing of North Viet Nam be halted, that the buildup of American troops and bases be stopped, and that a credible effort be made to secure negotiations.

If this advice had been followed months ago perhaps the present upheaval could have been avoided; after all, fighters on all sides are using American weapons. At least it should be clear that South Viet Nam is no more a nation now than it ever was, and that the United States has been supporting a transitory coalition of warlords who have a personal stake in keeping the military struggle alive and who are incapable of governing.

Washington cannot very well interfere in a fight between two factions of its "allies." But it can count on a still more rapid decline of American support for the war if the "allies" do not stop killing each other. The United States supposedly is in Viet Nam at the request of a duly-constituted government; what if there is no government?

We do not believe Mr. Johnson can ever make the war popular, but he could increase his own stature, and perhaps begin to pave the way for an honorable withdrawal, by convincing the people that he is honestly and clearly facing the facts as they are, not as he would like them to be. We do not know of any morale in Saigon that now could be damaged by such a frank appraisal.

Secretary of Defense McNamara made a remark in his Montreal speech that seems particularly apropos. "The realistic mind," he said, "is a restlessly creative mind—free of naive delusions, but full of practical alternatives." We hope Mr. Johnson was listening.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. The great English statesman Edmund Burke stated: War never leaves where it found a nation.

In Vietnam, with our tremendous firepower and napalm bombing we are engaged in defoliating and depopulating a nation of approximately 32 million men, women, and children living in an area about 2½ times the area of the State of Ohio where we have some 10 million people. In Vietnam in the north-central area and in the northwest there are vast mountain ranges and in other areas huge rivers, swamps, rice paddies, and uninhabitable jungles.

Secretary of State Rusk continually talks of aggression from the north as if North Vietnam were a foreign aggressor nation. Very definitely it is not. The Geneva agreement which Secretary of State John Foster Dulles approved, specifically stated:

The military demarcation line at the 17th parallel is provisional and should not in any way be considered as constituting a political or territorial boundary.

Historically, there is no North Vietnam nor South Vietnam. The Vietnamese are one people.

In 1954 the French forces numbering 200,000 were supplemented by thousands of Vietnamese, the Tories of that time

who fought against the nationalist forces, then termed Vietminh, fighting for freedom from French Colonialists, and then returned to civilian life. Many from the north migrated to the south as they were despised by some of their neighbors who fought for liberation. On the other hand, many from South Vietnam whose sympathies were with the Vietminh or who had actually fought with the Vietminh migrated to the north.

President Diem, who was installed as President of the Saigon Government, refused to permit the elections called for by the Geneva agreement, which our Government approved. General Eisenhower, in his reminiscences, stated it was well understood that Ho Chi Minh, regarded as the George Washington of Vietnam who had led the fight for the nation's freedom from French colonialism, would have received 80 percent of the vote in both North and South Vietnam had the elections been held, and the question of reunification of all of Vietnam would have been resolved. Without a doubt, the sinister hand of the CIA participated not only in installing Diem as President, but in directing his policies.

Many years ago Martin Luther, in a sermon, stated:

War is the greatest plague that can afflict humanity. It destroys religion, it destroys states, it destroys families. Any scourge is preferable to it.

He said this centuries before warplanes, heavy artillery and napalm bombing.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. The primary reason for our being in Vietnam today is our stubborn refusal to admit a mistake in our attempt to make Vietnam a pro-American and an anti-Chinese state. More than anything else, we are fighting to avoid admitting failure. We lost face by messing into a miserable civil war in Vietnam in the first place. We would not lose face were we to withdraw our forces to our coastal bases. As Walter Lippmann bluntly put it:

We are fighting to save face.

We would save face and win respect by withdrawing our forces from Vietnam.

Let it not be written by future historians that American boys died needlessly in far distant jungles because of weakness of diplomats and indifference of politicians. I wish I had as much confidence in the skill and intelligence of our diplomats in trying to settle this war as I do in the bravery and high competence of our soldiers fighting the war.

I was in southeast Asia most of the time from last September 28 to October 19. In South Vietnam I was in the field at every airbase, was at Cam Ranh Bay and on a carrier off the coast. In addition, I made observations in Thailand from whence our bombers have been striking targets in North Vietnam. My conclusions, based on my observations

and conferences with Generals Westmoreland, Stilwell, Prime Minister Ky, and others, changed from my views before making this on-the-spot survey. I had been led to believe that the Vietcong fighting us were Communist infiltrators from the north. Instead, I was informed by General Stilwell that 80 percent of the Vietcong fighting us in the Mekong Delta were born and reared in the Mekong Delta in what is called South Vietnam. General Westmoreland stated that the bulk of the Vietcong fighting the Americans and other Vietnamese were born and reared in South Vietnam.

Of course, there can be no armistice or cease-fire unless representatives of the Vietcong or National Liberation Front are seated as delegates along with delegates of the Saigon government, either the present regime or the one that will probably be succeeding the Ky regime. Also, delegates from Hanoi, as well as delegates representing the United States. Let us hope that administration leaders will be guided by the wisdom of U Thant, Secretary General of the United Nations, and will earnestly seek a cease-fire and withdraw our forces to coastal bases in South Vietnam and then withdraw altogether from what has become an American war.

Mr. President, every possible effort should be made to extricate ourselves from this miserable civil war in a land which is of no strategic importance whatever to the defense of the United States. We must not only explore alternatives to winning what is, in reality, an impossible war to win. Administration leaders must also give more serious consideration to the alternatives for deescalation of the war and eventual withdrawal—painful though that may be.

## ELECTION REFORM ACT OF 1966

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators NEUBERGER, MORSE, HART, COOPER, PROXMIER, and KUCHEL, I introduce President Johnson's proposed Election Reform Act of 1966.

I ask unanimous consent that I lie at the desk for 1 week to permit additional Senators to join as cosponsors; and I further ask that the text of the bill and the text of the President's message of May 26, 1966, accompanying the bill, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Pennsylvania; and, without objection, the text of the bill and the text of the President's message will be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, without describing at length the various provisions of this bill, I should like to call to the attention of Senators three key features which I find particularly commendable:

First, It would close the existing loophole under which State political commit-